



# COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

OF THE

SANSKRIT  $\mathbb{Z}$ LND,

GREEK, LATIN, LITHUANIAN, GOTHIC GERMAN

AND SLAVONIC LANGUAGES

BY

PROFESSOR I BOPP

—

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

EDWARD B EASTWICK FRS FSA MRAS

FMENT OLL E OXF RD MEM R F E IATI S IET E FIAN A  
MEAY F T G2 M V RI \ AL IETV A D F TH NILOL  
O TY F LO D V H HARY MEM ER F T E M WAS LI ER R  
S IETV PR FE R OF O ENT L LA G A E A D ID R MI  
T E EAST IN IA L E E H BURY A TRA LAT R F  
TIE ARTA TV M ER MI JA IN PREM  
S AR TH BA \_ O B A THE GOLI A T  
AN AR CH I ET ET Y

VOL I

SECOND EDITION

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE

LONDON, 14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN AND  
EDINBURGH, 20, SOUTH FRIDRICK STREET

PARIS B DUPRAT

LEIPZIG F A BROCKHAUS

—  
1856

LONDON

---

WILLIAM M WATTS, CROWN COURT TEMPLE BAR

THE CHAIRMAN, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN,

AND

THE DIRECTORS

OF THE

HONORABLE EAST-INDIA COMPANY

THE MUNIFICENT PATRONS OF INDIAN LITERATURE

THIS TRANSLATION OF A WORK

WHICH IRREFRAGABLY DEMONSTRATES THE COMMON ORIGIN

OF THE

LANGUAGES OF INDIA AND OF EUROPE,

IS WITH THEIR PERMISSION RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY

MOST FAITHFUL AND OBEIENT SERVANT

THE TRANSLATOR





# PREFACE

IN THE  
SECOND EDITION

---

IN giving to the Public this Second Edition of the English Translation of Bopp's great work on Comparative Grammar, it is right to state that the version has been approved by Professor Bopp himself, and that it has been again very carefully compared with the original, so that numerous errors which, from the great length of the work were perhaps hardly to be avoided in a first edition have now been corrected. The appearance of the original, too, in parts, and at considerable intervals of time led to some inconsistencies in the translation in the mode of expressing the value of certain letters but care has been taken to rectify this defect, also in the present edition. The Table of Contents is altogether new, and will be found to be very much more copious than the German.

Those who wish for an Introductory Notice before commencing the study of the Grammar, or who mean to content themselves with a general notion of what has been achieved by the Author may refer to the "Edinburgh Review," No CXCII p 298 and the 'Calcutta Review' No XXIV p 468. It will be there seen that this Work has created a new epoch in the science of Comparative Philology, and that it may be justly assigned a place in that department of study corresponding to that of 'Newton's Principia in Mathematics, Bacon's Novum Organum in Mental Science or Blumenbach in Physiology. The encomiums of the Reviewer have in fact been justified by

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

the adoption of the Work as a Lecture Book at Oxford, and by the extensive use which Rawlinson and other eminent scholars have made of it in their researches

It remains to be added, that while the Notes and Preface made by Professor Wilson, the former Editor, have been retained, I must be myself held responsible for the errors and defects, whatever they may be, of the present edition.

EDWARD B EASTWICK

HILFARYBURY COLLEGE,  
*February, 1854*

# PREFACE

TO THE  
FIRST EDITION

---

THE study of Comparative Philology has of late years been cultivated in Germany, especially, with remarkable ability and proportionate success. The labours of GRAMM, POTZ, BORR, and other distinguished Scholar, have given a new character to this department of literature and have substituted for the vague conjectures suggested by external and often accidental coincidences elementary principles, based upon the prevailing analogies of articulate sounds and the grammatical structure of language.

But although the fact that a material advance has been made in the study of Comparative Philology is generally known, and some of the particulars have been communicated to the English public through a few works on Classical Literature, or in the pages of periodical criticism yet the full extent of the progress which has been effected and the steps by which it has been attained, are imperfectly appreciated in this country. The study of the German language is yet far from being extensively pursued and the results which the German Philologists have developed and the reasonings which have led to them being accessible to those only who can consult the original writers, are withheld from many individuals of education and learning to whom the affinities of cultivated speech are objects of interest and inquiry. Translations of the works, in which the information they would gladly seek

for, is conveyed, are necessary to bring within their reach the materials that have been accumulated by German industry and erudition, for the illustration of the history of human speech.

Influenced by these considerations, Lord FRANCIS EGERTON was some time since induced to propose the translation of a work which occupies a prominent place in the literature of Comparative Philology on the Continent—the *Vergleichende Grammatik* of Professor BORP of Berlin. In this work a new and remarkable class of affinities has been systematically and elaborately investigated. Taking as his standard the Sanskrit language, Professor BORP has traced the analogies which associate with it and with each other—the Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, German, and Slavonic tongues: and whatever may be thought of some of his arguments, he may be considered to have established beyond reasonable question a near relationship between the languages of nations separated by the intervention of centuries, and the distance of half the globe, by differences of physical formation and social institutions,—between the forms of speech current among the dark-complexioned natives of India and the fair-skinned races of ancient and modern Europe;—a relationship of which no suspicion existed fifty years ago, and which has been satisfactorily established only within a recent period, during which the Sanskrit language has been carefully studied, and the principles of alphabetical and syllabic modulation upon which its grammatical changes are founded, have been applied to its kindred forms of speech by the Philologists of Germany.

As the *Vergleichende Grammatik* of Professor BORP is especially dedicated to a comprehensive comparison of languages, and exhibits, in some detail, the principles of the Sanskrit as the ground-work and connecting bond of the comparison, it was regarded as likely to offer most interest to the Philologists of this country, and to be one of

the most acceptable of its class to English students it was therefore selected as the subject of translation. The execution of the work was, however opposed by two considerations—the extent of the original, and the copiousness of the illustrations derived from the languages of the East the Sanskrit and the Zend. A complete translation demanded more time than was compatible with Lord F. EGERTON'S other occupations and as he professed not a familiarity with Oriental Literature he was reluctant to render himself responsible for the correctness with which the orientalisms of the text required to be represented. This difficulty was perhaps, rather over rated, as the Grammar itself supplies all the knowledge that is needed and the examples drawn from the Sanskrit and Zend speak for themselves as intelligibly as those derived from Gothic and Slavonic. In order, however, that the publication might not be prevented by any embarrassment on this account, I offered my services in revising this portion of the work, and have hence the satisfaction of contributing, however humbly to the execution of a task which I consider likely to give a beneficial impulse to the study of Comparative Philology in Great Britain.

The difficulty arising from the extent of the original work and the consequent labour and time requisite for its translation was of a more serious description. This, however has been overcome by the ready co-operation of a gentleman, who adds a competent knowledge of German to eminent acquirements as an Oriental Scholar. Having mastered several of the spoken dialects of Western India and made himself acquainted with the sacred language of the Parsees during the period of his service under the Presidency of Bombay Lieutenant EASTWICK devoted part of a furlough, rendered necessary by failing health, to a residence in Germany where he acquired the additional qualifications enabling him to take a share in the transla-

tion of the *Vergleichende Grammatik*. He has accordingly translated all those portions of the Comparative Grammar, the rendering of which was incompatible with the leisure of the Noble Lord with whom the design originated, who has borne a share in its execution, and who has taken a warm and liberal interest in its completion.

The *Vergleichende Grammatik*, originally published in separate Parts, has not yet reached its termination. In his first plan the author comprised the affinities of Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, and its Teutonic descendants. To these, after the conclusion of the First Part, he added the Slavonic. He has since extended his researches to the analogies of the Celtic and the Malay-Polynesian dialects, but has not yet incorporated the results with his general Grammar. The subjects already treated of are quite sufficient for the establishment of the principles of the comparison, and it is not proposed to follow him in his subsequent investigations. The first portions of the present Grammar comprise the doctrine of euphonic alphabetical changes, the comparative inflexions of Substantives and Adjectives, and the affinities of the Cardinal and Ordinal Numerals. The succeeding Parts contain the comparative formation and origin of the Pronouns and the Verbs. the latter subject is yet unfinished. The part of the translation now offered to the public stops with the chapter on the Numerals, but the remainder is completed, and will be published without delay.

With respect to the translation, I may venture to affirm, although pretending to a very slender acquaintance with German, that it has been made with great scrupulousness and care, and that it has required no ordinary pains to render in English, with fidelity and perspicuity, the not unfrequently difficult and obscure style of the original

H H WILSON

October, 1845

## PREFACE

---

I CONTEMPLATE in this work a description of the comparative organization of the languages enumerated in the title page, comprehending all the features of their relationship and an inquiry into their physical and mechanical laws, and the origin of the forms which distinguish their grammatical relations. One point alone I shall leave untouched, the secret of the roots or the foundation of the nomenclature of the primary ideas. I shall not investigate, for example why the root *z* signifies "go" and not "stand" why the combination of sounds *stha* or *sta* signifies "stand" and not "go". I shall attempt apart from this, to follow out as it were the language in its stages of being and march of development yet in such a manner that those who are predetermined not to recognise, as explained, that which they maintain to be inexplicable may perhaps find less to offend them in this work than the avowal of such a general plan might lead them to expect. In the majority of cases the primary signification, and, with it the primary source of the grammatical forms, spontaneously present themselves to observation in consequence of the extension of our horizon of language and of the confronting of sisters of the same lingual stock separated for ages, but bearing indubitable features of their family connection. In the treatment indeed of our European tongues a new epoch could not fail to open upon us in the discovery of another region in the world of language namely the Sanskrit\* of which it has been demonstrated, that in its

\* *Sanskrita* signifies 'adorned completed perfect' in respect to language *classic*, and is thus adapted to denote the entire family or race. It is compounded of the elements *sam* "with" and *kṛita* (nom *kṛita* *kṛita* *kṛitam*) "made" with the insertion of a euphonic *s* (§§ 18 96)



grammatical constitution, it stands in the most intimate relation to the Greek, the Latin, the Germanic, &c.; so that it has afforded, for the first time, a firm foundation for the comprehension of the grammatical connection between the two languages called the Classical, as well as of the relation of these two to the German, the Lithuanian, and Slavonic. Who could have dreamed a century ago that a language would be brought to us from the far East, which should accompany, *pari passu*, nay, sometimes surpass, the Greek in all those perfections of form which have been hitherto considered the exclusive property of the latter, and be adapted throughout to adjust the perennial strife between the Greek dialects, by enabling us to determine where each of them has preserved the purest and the oldest forms?

The relations of the ancient Indian languages to their European kindred are, in part, so palpable as to be obvious to every one who casts a glance at them, even from a distance in part, however, so concealed, so deeply implicated in the most secret passages of the organization of the language, that we are compelled to consider every language subjected to a comparison with it, as also the language itself, from new stations of observation, and to employ the highest powers of grammatical science and method in order to recognise and illustrate the original unity of the different grammars. The Semitic languages are of a more compact nature, and, putting out of sight lexicographical and syntactical features, extremely meagre in contrivance; they had little to part with, and of necessity have handed down to succeeding ages what they were endowed with at starting. The triconsonantal fabric of their roots (§ 107), which distinguishes this race from others, was already of itself sufficient to designate the parentage of every individual of the family. The family bond, on the other hand, which embraces the Indo-European race of languages, is not indeed less universal, but, in most of its bearings, of a quality infinitely more refined. The members of this race inherited, from the period of their earliest youth,

endowments of exceeding richness, and, with the capability (§ 108) the methods also, of a system of unlimited composition and agglutination. Possessing much, they were able to bear the loss of much and yet to retain their local life and by multiplied losses, alterations suppressions of sounds, conversions and displacements, the members of the common family are become scarcely recognisable to each other. It is at least a fact that the relation of the Greek to the Latin, the most obvious and palpable, though never quite overlooked, has been, down to our time grossly misunderstood and that the Roman tongue which, in a grammatical point of view, is associated with nothing but itself, or with what is of its own family, is even now usually regarded as a mixed language because in fact, it contains much which sounds heterogeneous to the Greek although the elements from which these forms arose are not foreign to the Greek and other sister languages as I have endeavoured partly to demonstrate in my "System of Conjugation" \*

The close relationship between the Classical and Germanic languages has with the exception of mere comparative lists of words copious indeed, but destitute of principle and critical judgment remained, down to the period of the appearance of the Asiatic intermediary almost entirely unobserved, although the acquaintance of philologists with the Gothic dates now from a century and a half and that language is so perfect in its Grammar and so clear in its affinities, that had it been earlier submitted to a rigorous and systematic process of comparison and anatomical investigation the pervading relation

\* Frankfurt a M 1816 A translation of my English revision of this treatise ( "Analytical Comparison of the Sanskrit Greek Latin and Teutonic Languages" in the 'Annals of Oriental Literature' London 1820 ) by Dr. Lachit is to be found in the second and third number of the second annual issue of Seebode's new Record of Philology and Pædagogical science. Grimm's masterly German Grammar was unfortunately unknown to me when I wrote the English revision and I could then make use only of Hickes and Fulda for the old German dialect

of itself, and, with it, of the entire Germanic stock, to the Greek and Roman, would necessarily have long since been unveiled, tracked through all its variations, and by this time been understood and recognised by every philologist\*. For what is more important, or can be more earnestly desired by the cultivator of the classical languages, than their comparison with our mother tongue in her oldest and most perfect form? Since the Sanskrit has appeared above our horizon, that element can no longer be excluded from a really profound investigation of any province of language related to it; a fact, however, which sometimes escapes the notice of the most approved and circumspect labourers in this department.† We need

\* Rask has been the first to supply a comprehensive view of the close relationship between the Germanic and the Classical Languages, in his meritorious prize treatise "On the Thracian Tribe of Languages," completed in 1814 and published in 1818, from which Vater gives an extract in his Comparative Tables. It cannot be alleged as a reproach against him that he did not profit by the Asiatic intermediary not then extensively known, but his deficiency in this respect shews itself the more sensibly, as we see throughout that he was in a condition to use it with intelligence. Under that deficiency, however, he almost everywhere halts halfway towards the truth. We have to thank him for the suggestion of the law of displacement of consonants, more acutely considered and fundamentally developed by Grimm (§ 87, and see Vater, § 12.)

† We refer the reader to the very weighty judgment of W. von Humboldt on the indispensable necessity of the Sanskrit for the history and philosophy of language (*Indische Bibl.* I 133). We may here borrow, also, from Grimm's preface to the second edition of his admirable Grammar, some words which are worthy of consideration (I vi.) "As the too exalted position of the Latin and Greek serves not for all questions in German Grammar, where some words are of simpler and deeper sound, so however, according to A. W. Schlegel's excellent remark, the far more perfect Indian Grammar may, in these cases, supply the requisite corrections. The dialect which history demonstrates to be the oldest and least corrupted must, in the end, present the most profound rules for the general exposition of the race, and thus lead us on to the reformation, without the entire subversion of the rules hitherto discovered, of the more recent modes of speech."

not fear that that practical and profound research in *utraque lingua* which is of most importance to the philologist can suffer prejudice by extension over too many languages, for the variety vanishes when the real identity is recognised and explained and the false light of discrepancy is excluded. It is one thing also, to learn a language, another to teach one, *æ* to describe its mechanism and organization. The learner may confine himself within the narrowest limits, and forbear to look beyond the language to be studied: the teacher's glance on the contrary, must pass beyond the confined limits of one or two members of a family and he must summon around him the representatives of the entire race in order to infuse life order, and organic mutual dependency into the mass of the languages spread before him. To attempt this appears to me the main requirement of the present period and past centuries have been accumulating materials for the task.

The Zend Grammar could only be recovered by the process of a severe regular etymology, calculated to bring back the unknown to the known the much to the little, for this remarkable language which in many respects reaches beyond and is an improvement on, the Sanskrit and makes its theory more attainable would appear to be no longer intelligible to the disciples of Zoroaster. Rask, who had the opportunity to satisfy himself on this head says expressly (V d Hagen, p 33) that its forgotten lore has yet to be rediscovered. I am also able I believe to demonstrate that the Pehlvi translator (tom II pp 476 et seq) of the Zend Vocabulary, edited by Anquetil has frequently and entirely failed in conveying the grammatical sense of the Zend words which he translates. The work abounds with singular mistakes, and the distorted relation of Anquetil's French translation to the Zend expressions is usually to be ascribed to the mistakes in the Pehlvi interpretations of the Zend original. Almost all the oblique cases by degrees come to take rank as nominatives the number too, are sometimes mistaken. Further we find forms

of cases produced by the Pehlvi translator as verbal persons, and next these also confounded with each other, or translated by abstract nouns \* Anquetil makes, as far as I know, no

\* I give the Zend expressions according to the system of representation explained in § 30, annexing the original characters, which are exhibited in type for the first time in this book, and which were lately cut at the order of the Royal Society of Literature by R Gotzlig, according to the exemplar of the lithographed M.S of M Burnouf I give the Pehlvi words exactly according to Anquetil (II 435) 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *ahmâhēm*, “*ἡμῶν*,” P *rouman* (cf p 502, *roman*, “*nos*”), A “*je*,” “*moi*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *ahubya*, “*bonus*” (with dual termination, § 215), P. *avaēh*, A “*bon*,” “*excellent*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *aētē*, “*hi*,” “*u*,” P *varman*, “*is*,” A “*lui*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *anhēm*, “*I was*,” or also “*I am*,” P *dyanounad*, “*he is*,” A “*il est*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *anheus*, “*mundi*,” P *ahhē*, A “*le monde*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *avaēshanm*, “*horum*,” P *varmouschan*, “*u*,” A “*eux*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *baraiti*, “*fert*,” P *dadh ouneschnē*, “*the carrying*” (*eschnē*, in Pehlvi, forms abstract substantives), A “*il porte*,” “*il exerce*,” “*porter*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *bīs*, “*twice*,” P *dou*, “*two*,” A “*deux*,” *berétebiō* (𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *baratibiyō*, “*ferentibus*?” unquestionably a plural dative and ablative), P. *dadrouneschnē*, “*the carrying*,” A “*porter*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *tē*, “*tui*,” P *tou*, “*tu*,” A “*toi*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *tâcha*, “*eaque*” (neut § 231), P *zakedj*, A “*ce*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *jatō*, “*the smitten*” (cf Sansk *hata* from *han*), P *maïtouned*, “*he smites*,” A. “*il frappe*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *janat*, “*he smote*,” P *maïtouneschnē*, “*the smiting*,” A “*frappe*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *zanthra*, “*per genitorem*,” P *zarhounad*, “*gignit*,” A “*il engendre*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *štrī*, “*femina*,” P *vakad*, A “*femelle*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *štrīm*, “*feminam*,” P *vakad*, A “*femelle*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *stân anm*, “*stellarum*,” P *setaran*, A “*les étoiles*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *fra-dâtâr*, “*to the given*,” or “*especially given*,” P. *feraz dcheschnē* (*nomen actionis*), A “*donner abondamment*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *gaēthanam*, “*mundorum*,” P *guehan* (cf 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥), A “*le monde*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *gâtûmcha*, “*locumque*,” P *gâh*, A “*lieu*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *nars*, “*of the man*,” P *guebna hamat adiah*, A “*un homme*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *nara*, “*two men*,” P. *guebna hamat dou*, A “*deux hommes*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *nâv ikananm*, “*feminarum*,” P *narîk hamat sé*, A “*trois (ou plusieurs) femmes*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *thryanm*, “*tiuum*,” P *sevin*, A “*troisième*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *vahmēmcha*, “*praeclarumque*,” P *neaeschnē*, “*adoratio*,” A “*je fais néaesch*,” 𐭠𐭣𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥𐭥 *vahmâû*, “*praeclaro*,” P *nâesch*, *konam*, “*adorationem facio*,” A “*je benis*

remark on the age of the Vocabulary to which I advert while he ascribes to another, in which the Pehlvi is interpreted through the Persian, an antiquity of four centuries. The

[illegible]

one in question cannot therefore be ascribed to any very late period. The necessity, indeed, of interpretation for the Zend must have been felt much sooner than for the Pehlvi, which remained much longer current among the Parsee tribes. It was therefore an admirable problem which had for its solution the bringing to light, in India, and, so to say, under the very eye of the Sanskrit, a sister language, no longer understood, and obscured by the rubbish of ages;—a problem of which the solution indeed has not hitherto been fully obtained, but beyond doubt will be. The first contribution to the knowledge of this language which can be relied on—that of Rask—namely, his treatise “On the age and authenticity of the Zend Language and the Zend-Avesta,” published in 1826, and made generally accessible by V. d. Hagen’s translation, deserves high honour as a first attempt. The Zend has to thank this able man (whose premature death we deeply deplore) for the more natural appearance which it has derived from his rectification of the value of its written characters. Of three words of different declensions he gives us the singular inflections, though with some sensible deficiencies, and those, too, just in the places where the Zend forms are of most interest, and where are some which display that independence of the Sanskrit which Rask claims, perhaps in too high a degree, for the Zend, a language we are, however, unwilling to receive as a mere dialect of the Sanskrit, and to which we are compelled to ascribe an independent existence, resembling that of the Latin as compared with the Greek, or the Old Northern with the Gothic. For the rest, I refer the reader to my review of Rask’s and Bohlen’s treatises on the Zend in the *Annual of Scientific Criticism* for December 1831, as also to an earlier work (March 1831) on the able labours of E. Burnouf in this newly-

self with having pointed out the possibility of another view of the construction, different from that which has been very profoundly discussed by Burnouf, and which is based on Nerosengh. The second passage signifies, “I call upon and magnify the stars, the moon, the sun, the eternal, self-created lights”

opened field. My observations derived from the original texts edited by Burnouf in Paris, and by Olsenius in Hamburg already extend themselves in these publications, over all parts of the Zend Grammar and nothing therefore has remained for me here, but further to establish, to complete and to adjust the particulars in such a manner that the reader may be conducted on a course parallel with that of the known languages, with the greatest facility towards an acquaintance with the newly discovered sister tongue. In order to obviate the difficulty and the labour which attend the introduction of the learner to the Zend and Sanskrit—difficulty sufficient to deter many, and to harass any one—I have appended to the original characters the pronunciation, laid down on a consistent method, or in places where for reasons of space, one character alone is given it is the Roman. This method is also perhaps the best for the gradual introduction of the reader to the knowledge of the original characters.

As in this work the languages it embraces are treated for their own sakes as objects and not means of knowledge, and as I am rather at giving a physiology of them than an introduction to their practical use it has been in my power to omit many particulars which contribute nothing to the character of the whole and I have gained thereby more space for the discussion of matters more important and more intimately incorporated with the vital spirit of the language. By this process and by the strict observance of a method which brings under one view all points mutually dependent and mutually explanatory, I have as I flatter myself succeeded in assembling under one group and in a reasonable space the leading incidents of many richly endowed languages or grand dialects of an extinct original stock. Special care has been bestowed throughout on the German. This care was indispensable to one who, following Grimm's admirable work aimed at applying to it the correction and adjustment that had become necessary in his theory of relations the discovery of new affinities, or the more precise definition of those discovered and to catch with greater truth at every step of grammatical progress, the



monitory voices of the Asiatic as well as the European sisterhood. It was necessary, also, to set aside many false appearances of affinity, as, for example, to deprive the *i* in the Lithuanian *geri* of its supposed connection with the *i* of Gothic, Greek, and Latin forms, such as *gôdar*, ἀγαθοί, *bom* (see p. 251, Note †, and compare Grimm I. 827. 11); and to disconnect the Latin *is* of *lupis* (*lupibus*) from the Greek *is* of λύκοις (λύκοι-σι). As concerns the method followed in treating the subject of Germanic grammar, it is that of deducing all from the Gothic as the guiding star of the German, and explaining the latter simultaneously with the older languages and the Lithuanian. At the close of each lecture on the cases, a tabular view is given of the results obtained, in which every thing naturally depends on the most accurate distinction of the terminations from the base, which ought not, as usually happens, to be put forward capriciously, so that a portion of the base is drawn into the inflection, by which the division becomes not merely useless, but injurious, as productive of positive error. Where there is no real termination none should be appended for appearance sake: thus, for example, we give, §. 148, p. 164, the nominatives χώρα, *terra*, *giba*, &c., as without inflection cf. §. 137. The division *gib-a* would lead us to adopt the erroneous notion that *a* is the termination, whereas it is only the abbreviation of the *ô* (from the old *â*, §. 69.) of the theme \*. In certain instances it is extraordi-

\* The simple maxim laid down elsewhere by me, and deducible only from the Sanskrit, that the Gothic *ô* is the long of *a*, and thereby when shortened nothing but *a*, as the latter lengthened can only become *ô*, extends its influence over the whole grammar and construction of words, and explains, for example, how from *dags*, "day" (theme *DAGA*), may be derived, without change of vowel, *dôgs* (*DÔGA*), "daily", for this derivation is absolutely the same as when in Sanskrit *ājata*, "*argenteus*," comes from *rājata*, "*argentum*," on which more hereafter. Generally speaking, and with few exceptions, the Indian system of vowels, pure from consonantal and other altering influences, is of extraordinary importance for the elucidation of the German grammar. On it principally rests my own theory of vowel change, which differs materially from that of Grimm, and which I explain by mechanical laws, with some modifications of my earlier definitions,

namely difficult in languages not now thoroughly understood to put on the right divisions, and to distinguish apparent terminations from true. I have never attempted to conceal these difficulties from the reader but always to remove them from his path.

The High German, especially in its oldest period (from the eighth to the eleventh century) I have only mentioned in the general description of forms when it contributes something of importance. The juxtaposition of it in its three main periods with the Gothic, grammatically explained at the close of each chapter is sufficient, with a reference also to the treatise on sounds intended to prepare and facilitate my whole Grammar, after the model of my Sanskrit Grammar. Wherever in addition, explanatory remarks are necessary, they are given. The second part will thus begin with the comparative view of the Germanic declensions and I shall then proceed to the adjectives, in order to describe their formations of gender and degrees of comparison, from these to the pronouns.

As the peculiarities of inflection of the latter must have, for the most part, already been discussed in the doctrine of the universal formation of the cases, inasmuch as they are intimately connected and mutually illustrative, what will remain to be said on their behalf will claim the less space and the main compass of the second division will remain for the verb. To the formation and comparison of words it is my intention to devote a separate work which may be considered as a completion of its antecedent. In this latter the particles conjunctions and original prepositions will find their place being I consider partly offshoots of pronominal roots, and partly nasal roots of

tions, while with Grimm it has a dynamic signification. A comparison with the Greek and Latin vocalism without a steady reference to the Sanskrit is in my opinion, for the German more confusing than enlightening, as the Gothic is generally more original in its vocal system and at least more consistent than the Greek and Latin which latter spends its whole wealth of vowels although not without pervading rules in merely responding to a solitary Indian *a* (*septurus* for *septumas* *quatuor* for *chatur* *as*  $\epsilon$   $\sigma$   $\rho$  *es* *momordi* *f* *r* *mamarda*)

this class of words,~ and which will, therefore, be treated in this point of view among the pronominal adjectives } It is likely that a chasm in our literature, very prejudicial to inquiries of this kind, may be shortly filled up by a work ready for the press, and earnestly looked for by all friends of German and general philology, the Old High German Treasury of Graff. What we may expect from a work founded on a comprehensive examination of the MS. treasures of libraries national and foreign, as well as on a collection of printed materials, may be gathered from a survey of the amount contributed to knowledge in a specimen of the work, small, but happily selected, "The Old High German Prepositions"

- I refer the reader preliminarily to my two last treatises (Berlin, Ferd Dümmler) "On Certain Demonstrative Bases, and their connection with various Prepositions and Conjunctions," and ' On the Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words " Compare, also, C Gottl Schmidt's excellent tract "Quæst Gramm de Præpositionibus Græcis," and the review of the same, distinguished by acute observations, by A Benary, in the Berlin Annual (May 1830) If we take the adverbs of place in their relation to the prepositions—and a near relation does exist—we shall find in close connection with the subject a remarkable treatise of the minister W von Humboldt, "On the Affinity of the Adverbs of Place to the Prepositions in certain Languages" The Zend has many grammatical rules which were established without these discoveries, and have since been demonstrated by evidence of facts Among them it was a satisfaction to me to find a word, used in Sanskrit only as a preposition (*aa*, "from,") in the Zend a perfect and declinable pronoun (§ 172) Next we find *sa-cha*, "*isque*," which in Sanskrit is only a pronoun, in its Zend shape *𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓* *ha-cha* (§ 53), often used as a preposition to signify "out of", the particle *𑀭𑀸𑀓* *cha*, "and," loses itself, like the cognate *que* in *absque*, in the general signification

"Remark—What in § 68 is said of the use of the *u* or *o* out of the older *a* is so far to be corrected according to my later conviction, that nothing but a retroactive influence is to be ascribed to the liquids, and the *u* and the *o*, in forms like *plintemu* (*mo*), *plintyu*, are to be exempted from the influence of the antecedent consonants."

† The arrangement thus announced, as intended, has undergone, as will be seen, considerable modification —*Editor*

# COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

## CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS

SANSKRIT writing distinguishes the long from their corresponding short vowels by particular characters slightly differing from these latter in form. We distinguish the long vowel and the diphthongs ए e and ओ o which spring from i and u united with an antecedent a by a circumflex. The simple vowels are first the three original and common to all languages a i u short and long secondly a vowel r peculiar to the Sanskrit which I distinguish by r and its long sound by ṛ. The short r (र) is pronounced like the consonant r with a scarcely distinguishable i and in European texts is usually written r; the long ṛ (ठ) is scarcely to be distinguished from the union of an r with a long i. Both vowels appear to me to be of later origin, and r presents itself generally as a shortening of the syllable ar by suppression of the a. The long ṛ (ठ) is of much rarer occurrence. In declension it stands only for a lengthening of the r where according to the laws of the formation of cases a short vowel at the end of the inflective base must be lengthened and in the conjugation and formation of words those roots to which grammarians assign a terminating र् r almost always substitute for this unoriginal vowel अर् ar इर ir उर ur or after labials ऊर् ur. The last simple vowel of the Sanskrit writing belongs more to the grammarians [G Ed p 9] than to the language it is in character, as well as in pronunciation an union of an ल l with र r (ठ) or when lengthened with र् (ठ). We require no representative for this vowel, and shall not further advert to it.

2 Sanskrit possesses two kinds of diphthongs. In the one

a short *a* united with a following *i* becomes ए *é* (equivalent to the French *ai*), and with *u* becomes औ *ô* (equivalent to the French *au*), so that neither of the united elements is heard, but both melt into a third sound. In the second kind, a long *â* with a following *i* becomes ऐ *ai*, and with *u*, औ *au*, as in the German words *waire*, *baum*; so that the two elements form indeed one syllable, but are both audible. In order, however, to fix the observation on the greater weight of the *a* in this diphthong, we write âi for ऐ, and âu for औ. That in ए *é* and औ *ô* a short, in ऐ *ai* and औ *au*, a long *a* is bound up, I infer from this, that where, in order to avoid a hiatus, the last element of a diphthong merges into its corresponding semi-vowel, out of ए *é* and औ *ô* proceed the sounds अय् *ay* and अव् *av* (with short *a*), but out of ऐ *ai* and औ *au* proceed अय् *ay* and अव् *av*. If, according to the rules of combination, a concluding आ *â*, with an इ *i*, ई *î*, or उ *u*, ऊ *û* of a following word, be contracted, like the short *a*, into ए *é* and औ *ô*, but not into ऐ *ai* and औ *au*, this, in my view, is to be understood as if the long *a*, before its combination with the initial vowel of the following word, had shortened itself. This should the less surprise us, as the long *a* before a dissimilar vowel of an appended inflexion or a suffix entirely disappears, and, for example, दादा *dadâ* with उस् *us* makes neither ददौस् *dadâus*, nor ददोस् *dadôs*, but ददुस् *dadus*. The opinion I have already expressed on [G. Ed p 3] this point I have since found confirmed by the Zend, in which ऽअ âi always stands in the place of the Sanskrit ऐ *ai*, and ऽऊ âo or ऽऔ âu for औ *au*. In support, also, of my theory, appears the fact, that a concluding *a* (short or long) with a following ए *é* or औ *ô*, becomes ऐ *ai* and औ *au*, of which it is to be understood, that the short *a* contained in *é* and *ô* merges with the antecedent *a* into a long *a*, which then, with the *i* of the diphthong *é*, becomes *ai*, and with the *u* of *ô*, becomes *au*. For example, भमैतत् *mamâitat*, from भम एतत् *mama êtat*, is to be understood

as if the diphthong  $\epsilon \acute{e}$  united its first element  $a$  with the preceding  $a$  into  $\acute{a}$ , and with this further united its last element ( $i$ ) into  $\epsilon \acute{a}$

3 Among the simple vowels the old Indian alphabet is deficient in the designation of the Greek epsilon and omicron ( $e$  and  $o$ ) whose sounds, if they existed when the Sanskrit was a living language yet could only have evolved themselves subsequently to the fixing of its written character out of the short  $a$  for an alphabet which lends itself to the subtlest gradations of sound would assuredly not have neglected the difference between  $a$   $e$  and  $\acute{o}$ , if the sounds had been forthcoming\*. It is important here to observe that in the oldest Germanic dialect namely the Gothic the sounds and characters of the short  $e$  and  $o$  are also wanting and that either  $a$   $i$  or  $u$  corresponds in that dialect to our German short  $e$ . For example *falltha* ich fälte I sold *giba* 'ich gebe

I give In the Zend the Sanskrit  $\text{अ} a$  remains usually  $a$  or has changed itself, according to certain [G Ed p 4] rules into  $\xi \acute{e}$ . Thus for example before a concluding  $m$  we always find  $\xi \acute{e}$  compare the accusative  $\text{पुत्रम्} \text{putra} m$  *putra* with  $\text{पुत्रं} \text{putra} m$  and its genitive  $\text{पुत्रस्य} \text{putra} sya$  In Greek the Sanskrit  $\text{अ} a$  becomes  $a$   $e$  or  $o$  without presenting any certain rules for the choice on each occasion between these three vowels but the prevailing practice is, that in the terminations of nominal bases the Greek  $o$  answers to the Indian  $\text{अ} a$  except in the vocatives where an  $e$  is substituted In the Latin besides  $\acute{a}$   $e$  and  $o$   $u$  also is employed in the terminations of nouns of the second declension and of the first person plural, as also in some adverbial suffixes to replace the Sanskrit  $\text{अ} a$

4 As in the Greek the short Sanskrit  $a$  is oftener replaced by  $e$  or  $o$  than by a short  $a$  so the long  $\text{आ} \acute{a}$  is oftener re-

\* Grimm Vol 1 p 594 with whom I entirely concur in this matter having long abandoned a contrary opinion which I maintained in 1810 in the Annals of Oriental Literature

presented by  $\eta$  or  $\omega$  than by a long alpha and though in the Doric the long  $\alpha$  has maintained itself in places where the ordinary dialect employs an  $\eta$ , no similar trace of the long  $\bar{a}$  for  $\omega$  is to be found दधामि *dadhāmi* "I place," becomes τίθημι, ददामि *dadāmi*, "I give," διδωμι, the dual termination ताम् *lām* answers to τῆν, and only in the imperative to τῶν on the other hand, the अस् *ām* of the genitive plural is always represented by ων. Never, if we except peculiarities of dialect, does either  $\eta$  or  $\omega$  stand for the Indian diphthongs ए  $\bar{e}$  or ओ  $\bar{o}$ , formed by इ  $i$  or अ  $a$  following a long  $\bar{a}$  for the first, the Greek substitutes  $\epsilon$  or  $\omicron$  (because for अ  $a$ , and also for  $\alpha$ ,  $c$  and  $o$  are the substitutes), and for the last,  $cv$  or  $ov$ . Thus, एमि *ēmi*, "I go," becomes  $\epsilon\mu$ , पतेस् *patēs*, "thou mayest fall," πίπτοις, दे *ēda*, "I know," οἶδα, गो *go*, mas fem "a bullock or heifer," βοῦς. From this dropping of the  $i$  or  $u$  in the Indian diphthongs  $\bar{e}$  and  $\bar{o}$  it

[G Ed p 5] may happen that  $\alpha$ ,  $c$ , or  $o$ , answer to these diphthongs, thus, एकतरस् *ekataras*, "one of two," becomes  $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ , देव *dēva*, "brother-in-law," Latin, *leui* (nom देवा *dēvā*, accus. देवम् *devam-am*), becomes  $\delta\alpha\eta\rho$  (from  $\delta\alpha F\eta\rho$ ,  $\delta\alpha i-F\eta\rho$ ), देवस् *dēva-s*, "God,"  $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ , and the  $o$  in  $\beta\omicron\acute{o}\varsigma$ ,  $\beta\omicron\iota$ , stands for  $\beta\omicron u-\acute{o}\varsigma$ ,  $\beta\omicron u-\acute{\iota}$ , the  $u$  of which must have passed into  $F$ , and certainly did so at first, as is proved by the transition into the Latin *bovis*, *bovi*, and the Indian गवि *gavi* (locative) from  $g\bar{o}-i$

5 In Latin we sometimes find the long  $e$ , which, however, may be shortened by the influence of the following consonant, arising from the mixture of  $a$  and  $i$ , as in the above-mentioned word *lēvir*, and in the subjunctive *amēmus* of कामयेम *kāmayēma* from *kāmaya-īma*

6 If we inquire after the greater or less relative weight of the vowels of different quality, I have discovered, by

\* The original has *devr*, but, as observed in p 1, in European texts it is usual to write  $vi$  for वृ, and the absence of any sign for the vowel sound is calculated to cause embarrassment it seems advisable, therefore, to express वृ by  $vi$ —Editor

various but sure appearances which I shall further illustrate in my treatise on Forms that in Sanskrit अ *a* and इ *i* are graver than the corresponding quantity of the vowel *i* and this discovery is of the utmost importance for every Treatise on special as well as comparative Grammar. It leads us in particular to important discoveries with respect to the Germanic modification of vowels. In Latin, also the *i* may be considered as lighter than *a* and generally takes the place of the latter when a root with an original *a* would otherwise be burthened with a reduplication of sound. Hence for example *abjicio* for *abjacio*, *tetigi* for *tetagi*. I am compelled by this view to retract an earlier conjecture that the *i* in *tetigi* was produced by a virtue of assimilation in the termination *i*. I have also to relieve myself from my former theory that the *e* in words like *inermis imberbis* instead of [G Ed p 6] *inarmis imbarbis* springs from a retrospective power of assimilation in the following *i* after the fashion of the modification of the vowel in German (Grimm p 80) and must place it in the same class with the *e* in such forms as *abjectus* and *tubicen*. The Latin radical *a* for instance is subject to a double alteration when the root is burthened with antecedent syllables or words: it becomes *i* in open syllables but *e* if the vowel is pressed upon by a following consonant unattended by a vowel. Hence we have *tubicen abjectus* in contrast to *tubicinis abjicio* and *inermis imberbis* not *inirmis imbirbis* on the contrary, *inimicus insipidus* not *inemicus insepidus*. In connection with this stands the transition of the first or second declension into the third. As *us* is the masculine form for *a*, we ought to say *inermus imbarbus* but *inermis imberbis* and other such forms owe their origin to the lesser weight of the *i*. With the displacement of the accent where it occurs this change of the vowel has nothing to do but the removal of the accent and the weakening of the vowel are nearly related and are both occasioned by the composition. In the Lithuanian we find similar appearances as for ex



ample, *pónas* "lord," at the end of compounds, is weakened into *ponis*, as *íótponis*, "councillor," Germ *rathsherr*."

7 Sanskrit Grammar gives no certain indication of the relative weight of the *u* with regard to the other original vowels. The *u* is a vowel too decided and full of character to allow of its being exchanged in this language, in relief of its weight, for any other letter. It is the most obstinate of all, and admits of no exclusion from a terminating syllable, in cases where *a* and *i* admit suppression. Nor will it retire

[G. Ed. p. 7] from a reduplicated syllable in cases where *a* allows itself to be weakened down to *i*. Thus in Latin we have *pupugi*, *tutudi*, while *a*, in cases of repetition, is reduced to *i* or *ě* (*tetigi*, *fefelli*, &c.) In the Gothic, also, the *u* may boast of its pertinacity: it remains firm as the terminating vowel of nominal bases where *a* and *i* have undergone suppression, and in no single case has it been extinguished or transmuted. No power, however, exists which will not yield at last to time, and thus in the High German, whose oldest records are nearly four centuries younger than Ulphilas, the *u* has, in many cases, given way, or become in declension similar to *i*.

8. If, in the matter of the relative dignity of the vowels, we cast a glance at another race of languages, we find in Arabic the *u* taking precedence in nobility, as having its place in the nominative, while the declension is governed by the change of the terminating vowel, *i*, on the contrary, shews itself to be the weakest vowel, by having its place in the genitive, the most dependent case of the Arabic, and one which cannot be separated from the governing word. *I*, also, is continually used in cases where the grammatical relation is expressed by a preposition. Compare, also, in the plural, the *ina* of the nominative with the termination *ina* of the oblique cases. *A* stands between the strong *u* and the weaker *i*, and under the threefold change of vowels has its place in the accusative, which admits of more freedom than the genitive. In the

oblique cases, however, of nouns, and in the two fold change of vowels it stands opposed to the *u* of the nominative, and in the dependent subjunctive of the verb to the *u* of the independent indicative.

9 Between the vowels and the consonants or at the close of the list of vowels, are commonly placed two signs, the sounds of which are rather to be considered as appendages to, or modifications of the preceding vowels, than as independent sounds, and take also no place in the alphabet of the Native Grammarians, inasmuch as they are considered neither as consonants nor vowels but rather as complements to the latter. The first, which we distinguish by *n* is called *Anuswara*, "echo" and is in fact, a thick nasal echo which I think is best represented by the nasal *n* at the end of a French syllable. The weakness of its expression is discernible in the fact that it does not, like a consonant impede the euphonic influence of an *i* or *u* on *n* following *s*, (see Sanskrit Grammar R 101<sup>a</sup>). It has its place before semi vowels (य् *y* र् *r* ल् *l* व् *v*) sibilants and *h* and we might thence term it the nasal of the two last lists of consonants, and assign its alphabetical place between them. A concluding म *m* followed by *n* consonant of the said two lists, passes into Anusvara for example अयम् *ayam* in this becomes अयम् *ayam* with the French nasal pronunciation of the *n* if such a word as रात्रि *rātri* in the night come after. In connection with the स् *s* of a verbal termination *n* radical न *n* also passes into Anusvara as हन् *han* thou killest from हन् *han*. Great confusion however has arisen from the circumstance that the Indian copyists allow themselves to express the unaltered concluding म् *m* as well as all the nasal alterations and, in the middle of words, each of the six nasal sounds (the proper Anusvara included), by Anusvara \* I have

The practice is not unauthorized by rule. A final न् *n* is convertible to Anusvara before any consonant (I An 8 3 23); and a medial न् *n* or म् *m* is convertible

endeavoured, in my Grammar, to remedy this confusion in the simple theory of Anuswâra. My predecessors in the treatment of Sanskrit Grammar make no distinction between the real and the supposititious Anuswâra. Colebrooke gives it, in [G Ed p 9] general, the pronunciation of *n*, and calls it "a shortening of the nasal consonants at the end of a syllable," which leads to the error, that each of the nasal characters, even the concluding न् *n*, may be abbreviated into Anuswâra. Forster expresses it by the *n* in the English word *plinth*, Carey and Yates by the English combination *ny*. Wilkins by *m*. All substitute it for the concluding न् of grammatical terminations and as they give rules for the transition of the Anuswâra into न् or न्, the necessary consequence occurs, that we must write *abhavan* or *abhavang*, "I was," *dantan* or *dontang*, "a tooth," not *abhavam*, *dantam*. Colebrooke, on the other hand, expressing a Sanskrit inscription in Roman letters (*Asiatic Transactions*, Vol VII) gives the proper termination *m*, and before *t*, by a euphonic rule, *n*, but he maintains the original *m* before sibilants and half vowels where Anuswâra is due, as *viduîshâm śîmad*, for विदुःशमं शिमाद. On the other hand, F. von Schlegel and Frank write *n*, for the value of Anuswâra, in the place of *m* in several grammatical terminations. The first, for example, gives *danan*, "a gift," for *dânam*, the second, *ahan* for *aham*, "I". A. W. von Schlegel gives rightly *m* instead of a spurious or representative Anuswâra at the end of words, and makes, for example, the infinitive termination in *tum*, not in *tun* or *tung*. He nevertheless, on this important point of grammar, retains the erroneous opinion, that the Anuswâra is a variable nasal, which, before vowels, must of necessity pass into *m* (Preface to the *Bhag Gita*, p. xv.), while the direct converse is the fact, that the concluding *m* is convertible to Anuswâra before any consonant except a semi-vowel or a nasal (Ib 8 3 24). Such are the rules. In practice, the mutation of the final न् is constant that of the medial nasal is more variable, and in general the change occurs before the semi-vowels and sibilants — *Eaton*

the variable nasal, which under certain conditions, passes into the proper Anuswara but before vowels ; necessarily retained both in writing and pronunciation. [G L : 10] That Von Schlegel also still continues the original  $\pi$  in at the end of words as an euphonic alteration of the dual sound of Anuswara appears from his mode of printing Sanskrit text in which he makes no division between  $n$  concluding  $\pi$  in and the commencing vowel of the following word while he does make a division after  $\tau n$  and thereby shows that he admits a division after terminating letters which remain unaffected by the influence of the letters which follow If however we write  $\pi\tau \sqrt{\text{मलिन}} \text{ tlm alraut}$  he said to them " we must also write  $\pi\tau \sqrt{\text{मलिन}} \text{ tlm alraut}$  he said to her not  $\pi\tau \sqrt{\text{मलिन}} \text{ tlm alraut}$  for the  $\pi$  of  $\pi\tau$  tlm is original and not as Von Schlegel thinks , being gotten out of Anuswara The conjecture of C Lassen (Ind Bibl Book III p 71) that the Anuswara is to be understood not as an after sound (*Nachlaut*) nor as an echo (*Nachhall*) but as a sound which regulates itself by that which follows—as it were the term *Nachlaut* with the accent on *laut*\*—appears to me highly improbable Schlegel's *namisimilabilis* would indeed be justified by this view and the imputation of error removed from the Indian Grammarians to whom we willingly concede a knowledge of the value of the Sanskrit signs of sound and whom we are unwilling to censure for designating a half so undesignable in a language whose term

\* This seems intended for an explanation for I wien has nothing like it. I have not found an etymological explanation of the term in any grammatical commentary. But it may be doubted if the explanation of the text or that given by Lassen, be correct. Anuswara may indeed be termed *sequens sibilus*, but by that is to be understood the final or closing sound of a syllable. Any other nasal may be used as the initial letter of a syllable, but the nasal Anuswara is exclusively an 'after sound' or final. It is not even capable of lending as it were, with a following vowel like a final *n* or *m* as in *śān* or *śānāṭ*. It is the legitimate representative of either of the other nasals when those are absolutely terminal.

nating sounds are almost always governed by the following words. It is true the half sound owes its being to the mutability of a concluding *m*, but is not mutable itself, since it never has an independent existence of its own at the end of any word in the middle, however, of a radical syllable, as दम् *dam*, हिम् *hims*, it is susceptible of expulsion, but not of alteration

[G Ed p 11] That the Indian Grammarians, however, consider the *m* and not the *n* as the original but mutable letter in grammatical terminations, like अम् *am*, ब्रह्मम् *bṛh̥m*, &c, appears from the fact that they always write these terminations, where they give them separate, with the labial nasal, and not with Anuswâra. If it be objected that this is of no importance, as dependent on the caprice of the editor or copyist, we can adduce as a decisive proof of the just views of the Indian Grammarians in this respect, that when they range the declensions of words in the order of their terminating letters, the Pronouns इदम् *idam*, and किम् *kim*, in which they consider the *m* as primitive, are treated when the turn comes of the labial nasal *m*, and together with प्रशमम् *praśam*, "quiet," from the root शम् *śam* (Laghu-Kaumudî, p 46)

10 The deadened nasal, which is expressed in the Lithuanian by particular signs over the vowel which it follows, appears to be identical with the Sanskrit Anuswâra, and we write it in the same manner with *ñ*. At the end of words it stands for the remainder of an ancient *m*, in the accusative singular for example, and the deadening of *n* before *s* into *ñ* presents

terminal, and in pronunciation retains their respective sounds, according to the initial consonant of the following word. Again, with regard to its relation to the semi-vowels and sibilants, it may be regarded as appropriate to them merely in as far as neither of the other nasals is so considered. In this sense Anuswâra may be termed a subsidiary or supplemental sound, being prefixed with most propriety to those letters which, not being classed under either of the five series of sounds, have no rightful claim to the nasals severally comprehended within each respective series.—*Editor*

a remarkable accordance with the Sanskrit rule of euphony before mentioned From *laupsin-u*, "I praise, therefore comes *laupsinsu* 'I shall praise as in Sanskrit हस्यसि *hansyāsi* 'I shall kill from the root हन् *han* In the Prakrit not only the *sm* but the *nn* at the end of words has always fallen into Anuswara without regard to the following letters Thus we read in Chezy's edition of the *Sakuntala* p 70 भक्ष्य which is certainly to be pronounced not *bhaalam* but *bhaavan* for भ भन् *bhagavan* [G Ed p 12] कुप *kudhan* for कुपन् *kutham* \*

11 The second of the signs before mentioned is named Visarga which signifies abandonment It expresses a breathing, which is never primitive but only appears at the end of words in the character of an euphonic alteration of स *s* and र *r* These two letters (*s r*) are very mutable at the end of words, and are changed into Visarga before a pause or the deadened letters of the guttural and labial classes (§ 12) We write this sign *h* to distinguish it from the true ह *h*

12 The proper consonants are classed in the Sanskrit alphabet according to the organs used in their pronunciation and form in this division five classes A sixth is formed by the semi vowels and a seventh by the sibilants and the ह *h* In the first five ranks of these consonants the single letters are so arranged, that the first are the surd or hard consonants, the thin (*tenues*) and their aspirates next the sonant or soft the medials and their aspirates each class being completed by its nasal The nasals belong like the vowels and semi vowels to the sonants the sibilants to the surd or hard Every thin and every medial letter has its corresponding aspirate The aspirates are pronounced like their

No native scholar would read these as *bhaalam* or *kudhan* as the text affirms, but *bhaalam*, *kudham*, agreeably to the final म represented by Anuswara —Editor

respective non-aspirates, with a clearly audible *h*, thus, for example, *त् th*, not like the English *th*, *क् kh*, not *f* or *ph*, and *ल् lh*, not like the Greek *χ*†. In an etymological point of view it is important to observe that the aspirates of different organs are easily exchanged with each other, thus, भर् *bhar*, धर् *dhar*, (भृ *bhri*, धृ *dhri*, § 1) “to bear,” “to hold,” are perhaps originally identical धूमन् *dhuima-*,

[G. Ed p 13] “smoke,” is, in Latin, *fumu-*. In Greek, θάνω, as well as φάω, is related to हन् *han*, from धन् *dhan*, “to kill.” The Gothic *thluhan* is the German *shen*, Old High German *uluhan*

13 The first class is that of the gutturals, and includes the letters क् *k*, ख् *kh*, ग् *g*, घ् *gh*, ङ् *n*. The nasal of this class is pronounced like the German *n* before gutturals, as in the words *sinken*, *enge*, so as to prepare for the following guttural. In the middle of words it is only found before gutturals, and, at the end, supplies the place of म् *m* when the following word begins with a guttural | We write it without the distinctive sign, as its guttural nature is easily recognised by the following consonant. The aspirates of this class are not of frequent use, either at the beginning or end of words. In some Greek words we find *χ* in the place of ख् *kh* compare ὄνυξ, ὄνυχ-ος, with *nakha*, “a nail,” λόγχη, κόγχος, with *śankha*, “shell,” χαίρω, χαῶ, with *lhan*, “to

The original here adds—“We designate the aspirate by a comma, as *t'*, *d'*, *b'*” The use of such a mark is, however, unsightly, and appears likely to cause occasional perplexity and doubt. It seems therefore preferable to adhere to the usual mode of expressing the aspirated letters, as *dh*, *bh*, and the like. It is only necessary to remember that *th* and *ph* are the letters *t* and *p* with an aspiration, and not the *th* and *f* of the English alphabet—*Editor*

† A careful examination will perhaps shew that the several nasals of the Sanskrit alphabet are mere modifications of one sound, according to the manner in which that is affected by a succeeding letter, and that the modifications prevail equally in most languages, although it has not been thought necessary to provide them with distinct symbols—*Editor*

dig As regards the sonant aspirates the *gh* of *gharma* heart (in Greek *θερμῆ*) has passed into the aspiration of another organ लघु *laghu* light has laid aside the guttural in the Latin *levis* and in virtue of the *l* changed the *u* into *v* The guttural has kept its place in the German *leicht* the English *light* and the Old High German *lhti*

14 The second class is that of the palatals and includes the sounds *ch* and *j* with their aspirates and nasals We write च *ch* छ *chh* ज *j* \* झ *jh* \* ञ *n* This class is an offshoot from the preceding and to be considered as a softening of it It is only found before vowels and weak consonants (semi-vowels and nasals) and before strong consonants and at the end of a word generally retires into the class from which it springs Thus for example the base [G Ed p 14] वाच *vāch* speech voice (cf *vox*) makes in the uninflected nominative वाक् *vāk* in the instrumental and locative plurals वाग्भिस् *vāgbhis* वासु *vāshu* In the cognate languages we have to look for in the place of the letters of this class first, gutturals next labials on account of their mutual affinity thirdly the sounds of *t* as according to pronunciation the first element of the palatals is a *t* or *d* fourthly sibilants as being the last element in the letters of this class Compare पचामि *pachāmi* I cook (mf *paktum* part pass *pakta*) with *coquo* πένω (πέντω πέντω, πέσσω) चतुर् *chatur* four nom चतुर् *chaturāras* with *quatuor* τετραρες *tes sapes* Gothic *fidūōr* Lithuanian *letturi* पञ्चन् *panchan* five (nom accus *pancha*), with *quinque* πεντε *pentē* Gothic *fimf* Lithuanian *penki*, राजन् *rājan* king with *rex* *regis*, रजत *rājata* nom *rājatam* silver (from *rāj* to shine) with *argentum* ἄργυρος *argyros* जानु *jānu* knee with *genu* γονυ With regard to the aspirates of this class, the *chh* as an initial letter in some words answers to *sc* σκ *sk* च्छन्द *chhind*

\* The original has *g* and *g* but the appropriate symbols in English are *j* and its aspirate



*mas*, "we cleave," चिन्मि *chlunadmi*, "I cleave," answers to the Latin *scindo*; छाया *chhâyâ*, "shadow," to the Greek σκιά. As the terminating letter of a root *chh* answers, in प्रश् *prachh*, "to ask," to the Gothic *h* in *frah*, "I or he asked," and to the German and Latin *g* in *frage*, *rogo*, in case that the latter, as I suspect, is a modification of *progo*. The nasal of this class, for which we require no distinctive sign, as it only precedes palatals, deviates but slightly from the sound of the guttural *n*, and is pronounced nearly like *ny*.

15 The third class is called that of the linguals or cerebrals, and embraces a peculiar kind of sounds of *t*, together with its [G Ed p 15] nasal, a kind not original, but which has developed itself from the ordinary class of *t* sounds. We distinguish them by a point under the letter, thus, ट् *t*, ट् *th*, ड् *d*, ड् *dh*, ण् *n*. In the Prâkrit this class has obtained great supremacy, and has frequently supplanted the ordinary *t*. We there find, for example, भोडु *bhōdu*, for भवतु *bhavatu*, "let it be," and पढम *padhama*, for प्रथम *prathama*, "the first." With regard to the nasal, the substitution of ण् for न् is nearly universal. The Indian Grammarians approach the Prâkrit nearer than the Sanskrit, when at the beginning of roots they use the same substitution. The practice, also, which we have condemned (§ 9.), of using Anuswâra for म् *m*, at the end of words, is more Prâkrit than Sanskrit. At the beginning of words these letters are seldom found in Sanskrit, but they are found as terminations to a certain number of roots, for example, अट् *at*, "to go." They are pronounced by bending back the tongue against the roof of the mouth, by which a hollow sound is expressed, as if from the head. The nasal of this class has sometimes overstepped the limits of its usual laws: it is found before vowels, which

\* Here, also, it may be doubted if similar modifications of the dental sounds are not discoverable in languages which do not express them by separate symbols. The *t* of the Italian *tutto* is the Sanskrit ट् —Editor

is not the case with the nasals of the preceding classes yet never at the beginning of words

16 The fourth class embraces the dentals or the sounds which properly answer to the common *d* and *t* together with the common *n* which belongs to them *तृत् पृथ दृद पृध न्न* Of the aspirates of this organ we have to remark, that *पृथ* in an etymological respect never—at least in no instance of which we are aware—is represented in Greek by *θ* but always like the natural *t* by *τ* On the other hand *पृध* does correspond to *θ* which also sometimes represents *दृद* Thus the imperative ending *पृधु* in Greek becomes *θι* मधु *madhu* honey wine is *μεθυ* दधामि *dadhāmi* I place *τιθημι* दुहितृ *duhitār* [G Ed p 16] (दुहितृ *duhitri* § 1) daughter *θυγατηρ* द्वार *duār* f and *duāra* neut (nom *duaram*) door *θυρα* देव *dēva* Lithuan *dievas* God *Oeos* With regard to the hard aspirate compare the terminations *τε* and *τον* with *पृथा* and *पृस* *thas* the former in the plural the second in the dual of the present and future *στήσω* with *स्थास्यामि* *sthāsyāmi* I shall stand *οστέον* with *ἄσθι* *asthi* bone in the Latin *rota* with *रथ* *ratha* carriage and in the Gothic the ending *t* in the second person singular of the preterite with *tha* for example *iaust* thou knewest with *वेत्थ* *vet tha* From the beginning of words in the Sanskrit this aspirate is nearly excluded

17 The interchange of *d* and *t* is well known Upon it among other instances is founded the relation of *lacryma* to *δακρυ δακρυμα* In Sanskrit also an apparently original *दृद* often corresponds to the *l* of cognate European languages for example दीप *dīp* to light दीप *dīpa* lamp becomes *λαμπω λαμπας* देह *dēha* body Gothic *leik* On this relation also rests, as I have shewn elsewhere, the relation of our *lf*, Gothic *lf* in *elf zwolf* Gothic *trialf* to दशन *dasan* δεκα *deka* As also the second consonant has undergone alteration and has migrated from the gutturals into the

labials, and as, moreover, the number "ten," taken alone, is, in Gothic, *tailun*, in German *zehn*, its origin from *lif* was deeply concealed, and even the Lithuanian *lika*, which accompanies the simple numbers in their compounded forms from eleven to twenty, remained long under my notice without result. The fact, however, that one and the same word may, in the course of time, assume various forms for various objects, proved, as it is, by numberless examples, requires no further

[G Ed. p 17] support. With respect to the affinity of *λίκος* in *ἡλίκος*, &c, and of the Gothic *leiks* in *in ēleiks*, "like to whom?" to *दृष्टि दृष्टा*, *Prákti fēdīsa*, "like," I refer the reader to my Treatise on the Pionoun and its influence (Berlin, published by Dummmler), and only remark, in addition, that by this analogy of *λίκος*, *leiks*, I was first led to that of *lif* to *δέκα*, while the Lithuanian *lika* had not yet attracted my observation.

18 The labial class comes next, namely, *प p*, *फ ph*, *ब b*, *भ bh*, *म m*. The hard aspirate *ph* is among the rarer letters, the most usual words in which it occurs are, *फल phala*, "fruit," *फेन phēna*, "foam," and the forms which come from the root *भुक् phull*, "to burst, blow, bloom." The sonant aspirate *bh* belongs, together with *ध dh*, to the most frequent of the aspirates. In the Greek and Latin, *φ* and *f* are the letters which most frequently correspond to this *bh*, especially at the beginning of words; for example, *भृ bhṛi*, "to bear," *fero*, *φέρω*, *भू bhū*, "to be," *fu-i*, *φύω*. *bh* is also often represented by *b* in Latin, especially in the middle of words. The *f* of *fero* becomes *b* in certain compounds which rank as simple words with a derivable suffix, as *ber*, *brum*, *brum*, in words like *saluber*, *candelabrum*, *manubrium*. Thus the *f* of *fu* appears as *b* in the forms *amabam*, *amabo*, which I have recognised as compounds, and which will be hereafter explained. The dative and ablative termination plural *भ्यस् bhyas*, becomes *bis* in Latin. The nasal of this class, *म m*, is subject, at the end of a word, to several alterations, and only remains fast before a pause, a

vowel or letters of its own class it otherwise governs itself according to the nature of the following letters and may pass in this manner into any of the four preceding nasals and weakens itself into the softened nasal sound [G Ed p 18] of the proper Anuswara if followed by a semi vowel a sibilant or ह h. *M* has also a full right to the name of a mutable nasal. It is however not beseeeming when in editions of a text otherwise conspicuous for accuracy we find म् though protected in its original condition by a pause or by the following letters written as Anuswara.

19 The semi vowels follow next य y र r ल l व v. We distinguish y by the sound of our German *j* or the English *y* in the word *year*. As the Latin *j* in English has the sound of a softened *g* so in Prakrit य y often passes into ज j and in Greek upon this exchange of sound rests the relation of ζευγνυμι ζυγος &c to the root युन् *yuj* to bind<sup>1</sup> and that of the verbs in αζω to the Indian verbs in अयामि *ayāmi*, for ζ is *ds* but the sound *dsch* is not to be looked for in the Greek. The relation of the Persian جوان *jarān* young to the Sanskrit Theme युवन् *yuvan* Lat *juvenis* belongs to this place. By v we here designate the sound of the German *w* and English *v*. After consonants as त्वाम् *tuām* thee this letter takes the pronunciation of the English *w*. The occasional hardening of the v into a guttural deserves mention here thus in Latin *vic-si* (*vixi*) *victum* spring from *uv* and in fact I recognise the Sanskrit causal भवयामि *bhāv ayā mi*

I make to be from the root भू *bhu*. The connection between *fac-tus* and *fio* is practically demonstrated. Refer back in the Old and Modern Greek to the occasional hardening of the Digamma into γ (cf C G Schmidt in the Berlin Jahrbuch 1831 p 613). The voice cannot dwell on य v or य y and these two letters are therefore as in the Semitic languages excluded from the end of words [G Ed p 19] therefore the word दिव *div* Heaven forms its nominative which ought to be *div* (*divs* being forbidden see § 94)

from द्यो *dyô*. Nominal bases in *y* do not exist. *ṛ* at the end of a word is subject to many alterations, and is interchangeable with *ṣ*. In places where the concluding *s*, by favour of the following letter, is retained, *ṛ* becomes *ṣ*, and, on the other hand, remains unaltered in places where *ṣ* becomes *ṛ*, namely, before vowels and sonant consonants.

20 The semi-vowels, by reason of their tractable and fluent nature, are easily interchanged. For instance, in the more recent Sanskrit works *ḷ* often stands for *ṛ*. We often, also, find in the cognate European languages *l* for *r*. On this interchange is founded the relation of the Latin suffix *lent* (e.g. *opulens*), and of the Gothic *laud(a)-s* (see § 116), in *hvélauds*, "quantus," *svalauds*, "tantus," *samalauds*, "just so much," to the Sanskrit *वन्त* *vant* (in the strong case, § 119), in words like *धनवन्* *dhanavant*, "endowed with wealth," *तवन्* *tavant*, "so much," *यवन्* *yavant*, "how much." On the change between *v* and *r* is founded, as I believe, the relation of the Old High German *pir-u-m's*, "we are" (sing. *pim*, *भवामि* *bhav-â-mi*), to *भवामस्* *bhav-â-mas*, as also that of *scir-u-mês*, "we shriek," to *श्रिययामस्* *śrîi-ayâ-mas*, "we make to hear" (§ 109), as also that of *trusu*, "I fall," from the [G Ed p 20] root *trus*, to the Sanskrit *ध्रुस्* *dhrus*, "to fall,"† and of the Cretan *τρῆ* "thee" from *τῆ*, to the Sanskrit *tvâ*. The semi-vowel *l* is also exchanged with the nasals, thus, *अन्यस्* *anya-s*, "the other," becomes *ahus* in Latin, and

† It is scarcely correct to say "often," as the instances are rare nor are they restricted to recent works. Menu has *âśliha* for *âśrika* — Ed

† Gumm (in p 46) assumes an adjective *lauds*, "great," which, as far as the Gothic at least is concerned, might be dispensed with, as it is of the greatest antiquity as a suffix, and does not appear alone as an adjective, even in the oldest periods

‡ *Dh*, according to § 16, = the Greek *θ*, and to the *θ*, according to § 87, corresponds the old High German *t*. The *u* of *trus*, from the old *a*, may be produced by the influence of the *r*, or of the dropped nasal

अन्तरा *antara* s the other *alter*, वद् *vad* to speak  
 answers to the Gothic *lath on* 'called' invited, *ga lathôn*,  
 called together आ *dhma* to blow answers to *flare*  
 (§ 109) Compare also, *balbus* with βαλβανω

21 The 1st class embraces the sibilants and *h* श *s* ष *sh*  
 स *s* and ह *h* The first sibilant is spoken with a slight aspi-  
 ration and usually written by the English *sh* \* It belongs to  
 the palatal class and thence supplies the place of the third or  
 proper स *s* when र hard palatal च *ch* or छ *chh* follows for  
 instance रामश्चरति *rāmas charati* instead of रामश्चरति *rāmas*  
*charati* Ramas goes In its origin श *s* appears to have  
 sprung from *h* and in Greek and Latin we find *κ* and *c* regu-  
 larly corresponding to the Sanskrit श *s* The Gothic substi-  
 tutes *h* in pursuance of the law of change of sound but the  
 Lithuanian stands the nearest to the Sanskrit with reference  
 to this letter and has in its stead a sibilant compound *sz*, pro-  
 nounced like *sh* Compare *decem* देका Gothic *taihun* Lithuanian  
*deszimtis* with दशन् *dasan* (nom दश *dasa*) canis कुवा Gothic  
*hunds* Lithuanian *s-uo* (gen *s uns*) with शन् *śuan* (nom श *śud*  
 gen शुन् *śunas* κυος) 'dog' δακρυ *lacrima* अशरा *f* with  
 अश्रु *asru* n 'tear, equus (= *ecvus*) Lith *as-ica* *f* mare  
 with अश्व *asua* (nom अश्वश् *aswas*) horse *s-aka* *f* with  
 शाखा *sāl hā* bough The Lith *s uenta* s holy answers  
 to the Zend *spenta* (§ 50) At the end of a word  
 and in the middle before strong consonants श *s* is not al-  
 lowed although admitted as an euphonic substitute for a con-  
 cluding स *s* before an initial hard palatal Otherwise श *s*,  
 usually falls back into the sound from which [G Ed p 21]  
 it appears to have originated namely, *h* In some roots  
 however श *s* passes into ट *t*, for instance दृश् *dris* seeing  
 and विश्व *vis* a man of the third caste form in the un-  
 fleeted nominative दृक् *drish* विट *vit* The second sibilant  
 ष *sh* is pronounced like our *sch* or *sh* in English and

\* More usually *s* the *sh* is reserved for the cerebral sibilant —Editor

belongs to the lingual class. It often steps, according to certain rules into the place of स् s, thus, for instance, after क् k, स् s never follows, but only ष sh; and the ξ, ρ, in Greek and Latin, are regularly represented by क्ष ksh. Compare दक्षिण *dakṣhina*, with *dex-ter*, δεξιός, Lithuanian *dészimė*, "the right hand." Of the vowels, i, u, and ī, short or long, are averse from स् s, to which a and ā alone are inclined. After the first-named vowels, स् s passes into ष sh, for instance, ननोषि *tanôshi*, instead of ननोसि *tanôsi* (*extendis*). As an initial, ष sh is extremely rare. The Indian grammarians, however, write the roots which, under certain circumstances, change स् s into ष sh, from the first with a ष sh. A word which really begins with ष sh is षष् *shash*, "six," to which the Lith *szeszī*, a plural nominative, answers most nearly, while other cognate languages indicate an original ordinary s. At the end of a word, and in the middle before other strong consonants, such as द t, ठ th, ष sh is not permitted, but in most roots passes into क् k, but with some into द t. The number six, mentioned above, becomes, in the uninflected nominative, षट् *shat*.

22 The third sibilant is the ordinary s of all languages, but which, at the end of Sanskrit words, holds a very insecure position, and by certain rules is subjected to transmutation into श् ś, ष sh, र r, : ah or h Visarga (§ 11.), and u, and only remains unaltered before t and th. We write, for example, सूनुस् *sūnus tarati*, "the son passes over," but ननति सूनुः *tarati*. [G Ed p 22] *sūnuh*, सूनुश् चरति *sūnuś charati* (it), सूनु भवति *sūnu bhavati* (est). This sensitiveness against a concluding स s can only have arisen in the later period of the language, after its division, as in the cognate languages the concluding s remains unaltered, or where it has been changed for r does not return into its original form. Thus, in the decree against Timotheus (Maittaire, § 383-4) ρ everywhere stands for s. Τιμόθεος ὁ Μιλήσιος παραγινόμενος λυμαίνε-ται τὰ ἀκοὰρ τῶν νέων, &c. The Sanskrit could not endure

*r* before *t* The Latin protects the *s* usually at the end of words, but in the classical period generally sacrifices it when between two vowels to the *r* for instance *genus generis*, for *genesis*, a contrast to forms found in Varro and Festus such as *plusima*, *faedesum*, *meliosema* *majosibus* in which the *s* evinces its original existence in the history of the language (see § 127) The accusative form *arbosem* recorded by Festus is more startling for here *r* is the original form if as I can hardly doubt, *arbor arboris*, is related to the word of such frequent occurrence in the Zend Avesta *urvara* tree This expression is not wanting in the Sanskrit (उर्वरा *urvārā*) but it signifies according to Wilson fruitful land and land in general

23 *h* belongs to the letters which in Sanskrit are never admitted at the end of words nor in the middle before strong consonants In these places it passes by certain rules into *ṭ* / *ḍ* / *ṣ* / *ṇ* / *ṅ* / *ṇ* In Greek we often find *χ* in the place of the Sanskrit *h* compare *χαίμων* *huems* with हिम *hima* snow *rimo* *χαίρω* with हृषि *hrish* [G Ed p 23] *yāmī gaudeo* *χη* with हंस *hansa* goose *χθες* *heri* with ह्यस् *hyas* yesterday *ὄχος* with वह् *vah* to transport We also find *κ* *c* for *h* compare *καρδία* *cor* Gothic *hairto* with हृद् *hrīd* (न हृदय *hrīdaya*) heart We sometimes but rarely find the spiritus asper substituted for *h* for instance, *αἰρω* हारामि *harāmi* I take away The Lithuanian exhibits sometimes *sz* for *h* for instance *as-* I for अहम् *aham szirdis* f heart for हृद् *hrīd* This letter stands sometimes in Sanskrit for a mutilation of other aspirated consonants of which the aspiration alone has been suppressed thus instead of the imperative ending *fy dhī* we generally find *hi* on which account the grammarians accept *हि hi* and not *फि dhi* as the original ending and assume that *hi* passes into *dhi* for euphonic reasons after consonants The root ग्रह *grah* to take is written in the Vedas ग्रम् *grabh* and answers thus more nearly to the German *greifen* and the Persian *griflan*



We give here a general view of the Sanscrit characters, with their respective values.

## VOWELS

अ *a*, आ *ā*, इ *i*, ई *ī*, उ *u*, ऊ *ū*, ऋ *ṛ*, ॠ *ṝ*

## ANUSWÂRA AND VISARGA

• *n*, : *ah*.

## CONSONANTS

Gutturals	क <i>k</i> , ख <i>kh</i> , ग <i>g</i> , घ <i>gh</i> , ङ <i>n</i>
Palatals	च <i>ch</i> , छ <i>chh</i> , ज <i>j</i> , झ <i>jh</i> , ञ <i>n</i>
Linguals	ट <i>t</i> , ठ <i>th</i> , ड <i>d</i> , ढ <i>dh</i> , ण <i>n</i>
Dentals	त <i>t</i> , थ <i>th</i> , द <i>d</i> , ध <i>dh</i> , न <i>n</i>
Labials	प <i>p</i> , फ <i>ph</i> , ब <i>b</i> , भ <i>bh</i> , म <i>m</i>
Semi-Vowels	य <i>y</i> , र <i>r</i> , ल <i>l</i> , व <i>v</i>
Sibilants and Aspirates,	श <i>ś</i> , ष <i>sh</i> , स <i>s</i> , ह <i>h</i> .

[G Ed p 24] The vowel characters given above are found only at the beginning of words, and in the middle or end of a word are supplied in the following manner अ *a* is left unexpressed, but is contained in every consonant which is not distinguished by a sign of rest (˘) or connected with another vowel क *k* is thus read *ka*, and *k* by itself, or the absence of the *a*, is expressed by क् इ *i*, ई *ī*, are expressed by ऋ, ॠ, and the first of these two is placed before, the second after, the consonant to which it relates, for instance, कि *ki*, की *kī* For उ *u*, ऊ *ū*, ऋ *ṛ*, ॠ *ṝ*, the signs उ, ऊ, ॠ, ॡ, are placed under their consonants, as, कु *ku*, कू *kū*, कृ *kṛ*, कॄ *kṛ* For ए *e* and ऐ *āi*, े and ै are placed over their consonants, as, के *ké*, कै *kāi* ओ *o* and औ *āu* are written by omission of the अ, which is here only a fulcrum, as, को *kó*, कौ *kāu* The consonants without vowels, instead of appearing in their entire shapes, and with the sign of rest, are usually written so that their distinctive sign is connected with the following consonant, for instance, for त्, स्, य्, we have त्, स्, य्, and thus *matsya* is written मत्स्य, not मत्स्य, for ज् + ज् we have ज्ञ, and for क् + घ् we have क्घ

25 The Sanskrit letters are divided into hard or surd and soft or sonant. Surd are all the tenues with their corresponding aspirates, and in fact according to the order given above the first two letters in each of the first five rows also the three sibilants. Soft are the medials with their aspirates the  $\text{ṛ}$  the nasals semi vowels and all vowels. Another division also appears to us convenient—that of the consonants into strong and weak in which the nasals and semi vowels come under the denomination of weak the remaining consonants under that of the strong. The weak consonants and vowels exercise no influence as initial letters of inflections and suffixes in the formation of words on the terminating [G Ed p 20] letters of a root while they themselves are compelled to accommodate themselves to a following strong consonant.

26 With regard to the vowels, it is of consequence to direct the observation to two affections of them of frequent occurrence in the development of forms of Sanskrit of which the one is called Guna or virtue the other Vriddhi increase or augmentation. My predecessors in grammatical inquiry have given no information as to the essence but have only expounded the effects of these vowel alterations and it was only in my critical labours upon Grimm's German Grammar\* that I came upon the trace of the true nature and distinctive qualities of these affections as also of the law by which Guna is usually produced and governed and at the same time of its hitherto undetected existence in the Greek and Germanic and most conspicuously in the Gothic. My views in this particular have since derived remarkable confirmation from the Zend with relation to which I refer to § 2 in which as I flatter myself I have dealt successfully with an apparent contradiction to my explanation. Guna consists in prefixing short *a* and Vriddhi in prefixing a long one in both however the *a* melts into a diphthong with the primitive vowel

\* Berlin Journal 1 cb 1827 p 204

according to certain euphonic laws इ *i*, namely, and ई, melt with the अ *a* of Guna into ए *e*; उ *u*, ऊ *ū*, into ओ *ō*. These diphthongs, however, dissolve again before vowels into अय् *ay* and अव् *av*; ऋ *ṛ* and ॠ *ṛī* become, in virtue of the action of Guna, अ *a*, by that of Viddhi, अद् *ad*. As in Greek the [G Ed p 26] short Sanskrit *a* is frequently replaced by *e*, so we find the Guna here, when a radical *i* or *u* is prolonged by prefixing an *e*. As in the Sanskrit the root इ *i*, "to go," forms, by the Guna modification, एमि *ēmi* (from *a-mi*), "I go," in contrast to *imas*, "we go," thus in Greek also we have εἶμι in contrast to ἴμεν. As the root बुध् *budh*, in several tenses in the three numbers, rises, in virtue of Guna, into बोध *bōdh* (from *baudh*), for instance, बोधामि *bōdhāmi*, "I know," so in the Greek\* the root φϋγ (*ēφυγοι*), in the present becomes φεύγω. In the Gothic, in the strong form of Grimm's 8th and 9th conjugations, the radical vowel, strengthened by *a* in the singular of the preterite, stands in the same contrast to the *i* and *u* of the plural, as is the case in the corresponding tense of the Sanskrit. Compare *baug*, "I bent," in contrast to *bugum*, "we bent," with the Sanskrit form of the same signification, singular बुभोज *bubhōja*, plural बुभुजिन् *bubhujima*, of the root भुज् *bhuj*, compare *vait*, "I know," in contrast with *vitum*, "we know," with the Sanskrit forms of the same signification, वेद *vēda* (from *vaida*), विदिम *vidima*, from the root विद् *vid*, "know," which, like the corresponding Gothic and Greek root, employs the terminations of the preterite with a present signification.

27 We have, however, the Sanskrit Guna in yet another form in the Gothic a form which I have but lately discovered, but of which the historical connection with the Sanskrit modification appears to me not the less certain. I once thought that I had accounted in a different manner for the relation existing between *bauga*, "I bend," and its root

\* Regarding Greek *oi* as Guna of *i*, see § 491, and as to Guna in Old Slavonic and Lithuanian, see §§ 255 b) n, 741, 746

bug and I conceived myself bound to ascribe generally in the present tense to the prevalent  $\iota$  of terminations a retro-active influence. It now however seems to me indisputable that Grimm's 8th and 9th conjugations of the [G Ed p 27] first class correspond to my first Sanskrit conjugation (r 326) so that the Guna  $\alpha$  of the special tenses has been weakened to  $\iota$  while the monosyllabic preterite maintains the Guna vowel in the more important shape of  $\alpha$  just as in the 10th 11th and 12th conjugations according to Grimm's division the radical  $\alpha$  which has remained in the preterite singular is in the present and other tenses weakened to  $\iota$  so that for instance *at* I and *he eat* corresponds to the root  $\text{अट्}$  *ad* 'to eat' but in the present, *ata* stands in place of the form  $\text{अस्मि}$  *admi* I eat \*

28 The Zend possesses besides the Sanskrit Guna which has remained everywhere where it stands in Sanskrit a vowel application peculiar to itself which likewise consists in *a* and which was first observed by M E Burnouf † The vowels which admit this addition in the interior but not at the end of words are first the short *i* *e* *o* 2dly the Guha diphthongs *ai* *au* and *oi* The two latter are the most usually benefited by this addition and *ai* takes it in all cases where the opportunity occurs both as an initial letter and even at the end of words wherever the dependent particle *-cha* and is appended to it hence for example *huwaia nare homini huwa oihre ' igne* but *huwaia naraēcha hominūque huwa oihraēcha igne que* Also where an *e* stands in two consecutive syllables an *a* is placed before each Hence for instance *aitāibyaō* from *ऐतैभ्यः étēbhyaḥ* The only case in which ex-

\* It would be difficult to adduce a better instance of the phonetic deficiencies of our English alphabet than this sentence in which I am forced to translate the present and past tenses of *essen* by the same characters. What foreign student could guess or remember that the one is pronounced *ees* the other *ett*? The preterite *ate* is obsolete.—Translator



हृत् *ruch* हृत्सुच्यन्तम् *sauchantam* (*lucentum*) with  
 सुच्यन्तम् *suchyātām* अक्षन्तम् *aocta* 'he spoke' with उक्त *ukta*  
 which I form by theory after the analogy of अक्षिप्त *akshipta*  
 (Grm Crit r 389) leaving out the augment

29 In the Vriiddhi modification the vowels इ i ई ē melt with the preceding छा ā into ऐ ai, उ u ऊ ū into औ au च्च ri into चार् dr The simple vowel अ a as also the diphthongs ए e and ओ o which would produce the same effect by Guna as by Vriiddhi—for a+a like ā+a makes ā a+ē like ā+ē makes ai a+ō like ā+ō makes au—are capable of only one higher modification and reserve this one for cases where grammatical laws demand the highest step namely Vriiddhi and remain in the cases of Guna unaltered unless extraordinary grounds of exception occur It may be convenient here to give a connected summary of the results produced by Guna and Vriiddhi

Primitive Vowels	अ a	आ ā	इ i	ई ī	उ u	ऊ ū	ए e
Guna			ए e	ई ī	ओ o	औ au	अर ar
Vriddhi	आ ā	ऐ ai	ऑ au	ओ ō	औ āu	आर ār	

Primitive Vowels	अ <i>ri</i>	इ <i>ē</i>	ए <i>ai</i>	ओ <i>ō</i>	औ <i>au</i>
Guna	अर् <i>ar</i>				
Vriddhi	आर् <i>dr</i>	ऐ <i>ai</i>		औ <i>au</i>	

30 We now proceed to the exposition of the Zend writing which, like the Semitic proceeds from right to left and towards the comprehension of which Rask has contributed valuable corrections which give the language an appearance more natural and more in consonance with the Sanskrit than it assumed in the hands of former commentators Anquetil's pronunciation having admitted much that was heterogeneous especially in the vowels We follow the order of the Sanskrit

\* According to original Grammars the Guna letters are *a e o* the Viddhi *ā ai au*, the two first *a* and *ā* being severally substituted for the vowel sounds of *ri* *ri* in combination with the semi vowels *r* and *l* as *ar al, ar, āl* —Editor

alphabet in giving the corresponding value of each letter in [G Ed p 30] the Zend. The Sanskrit short ञ *a* has two, or rather three, representatives, the first is *ɔ*, which Anquetil pronounces as *a* or *e*, but Rask, certainly with truth, limits to *a*. The second is *ɛ*, which Rask pronounces like the short *æ* of the Danish, or like the short German *a*, as in *Hande*, or as *a* in *cane* in English, and *e* in the French *apris*. I consider this *ɛ* as the shortest vowel, and write it *ě*. We often find it inserted between two consonants which form a double consonant in the Sanskrit, for instance, *ɔɔɛʃɔɔɔ dadarěša* (pret redupl), for the Sanskrit *ददरि dadarśa*, "he" or "I saw," *ɔɔɔɛɛɔɔ daděmahī* (V S p 102), "we give," for the Vēda form *ददमि dadmasi*. This shortest *ě* is also always appended to an originally terminating *r*. Thus, for instance, *ɛʃɔɔɔɔ antarě*, "between," *ɛʃɔɔɔɔ dātārě*, "giver," "creator," *ɛʃɔɔɔɔ hvarě*, "sun," stand for the corresponding Sanskrit forms *अन्तर antar*, *दातर dātār*, *स्व svar*, "heaven." It is worthy also of remark, that always before a final *ɛ m*, and generally before a final *ɔ n*, and frequently before an intermediate vowelless *ɔ n*, the older *ञ a* becomes *ɛ ě*. Compare, for instance, *ɛɛʃɔɔɔ puthrě-m*, "filium" with *पुत्रम् putra-m*, *ɔɛɔɔɔ anh-ěn*, "they were," with *आसन् āsan*, *ḥṣan*, *ɛɛɔɔɔ hēnt-ēm*, "the existing one," with *सन्तम् sant-am*, *præ-sentem*, *ab-sentem*. This retro-active influence of the nasal reminds us of the shortening power of the Latin termination *m*, as, for instance, *slēm*, *slēmus* (Sanskrit *तिथ्यम् tishthēy-am*, *तिथ्य tishthēma*).

31 Anquetil entirely refuses to admit into his alphabet a letter differing but little from the *ɛ ě* above discussed, but yet distinct from it by rule in practice, namely, *ɛ*, which Rask teaches us to pronounce like a long Danish *æ*. We find this letter usually in connection with a following *ɔ u*, and this vowel appears to admit, with the excep- [G Ed p 31] tion of the long *ɔ ā*, no vowel but this *ɛ* before it. We write this *ɛ e* without the diacritic sign, inasmuch as we represent the *ɔ*, like the Sanskrit *ऋ*, by *ā*. *Eu ɔɛ* corresponds etymo-

logically to the Sanskrit ओ *o* or diphthong formed by अ *a* and उ *u*, thus for example the nominal bases in *u* which in the Sanskrit genitive by the influence of गुण *i* *e* by the prefixing of a short *a* make *os* form in Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬭 *eus*. Compare for instance 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭 *paseus* with 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 *pasōs* from *pasu* *pecus*. And yet the Sanskrit *o* does not universally become *eu* in Zend but often remains as it is and specially in cases where it arises out of the termination as by the solution of the *s* into *u*. According to its pronunciation 𐬨𐬀 *eu* would appear to be a diphthong and to form but one syllable as in our German words *heute Leute* &c. The long *a* (*ā*) is written 𐬨

32 Short and long *i* are represented as are long and short *u* by special characters 𐬨 *i* 𐬨 *i* 𐬨 *u* 𐬨 *u*. Anquetil however gives to the short *i* the pronunciation *e* and to the short *u* (*y*) that of *o*, while according to Rask only 𐬨 is pronounced as short *o*\*. This short *o* frequently holds the etymological place of the Sanskrit उ *u* and never corresponds to any other Sanskrit vowel. For the diphthong ओ *au* in particular we have generally the Zend 𐬨𐬀 *āo* we yet find sometimes also 𐬨𐬀 *āu* for instance 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 *gaus* *bos* is more frequent than 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 *gaos* for the Sanskrit गौ *gaus*.

33 The Sanskrit diphthong *e* formed out of *a* + *i* is represented by 𐬨 which especially as a terminating letter is also written 𐬨 and which we as in Sanskrit represent by *e*. We must here however observe that the Sanskrit ऐ *ai* is not always preserved as 𐬨 *ai* in the Zend but is sometimes replaced by 𐬨 *ai* which appears to prevail particularly after a preceding 𐬨 *y* especially at the end of [G Ed p 32] words. The Viddhi diphthong ऐ *ai* (out of *ā* + *i*) is always represented by 𐬨 *ai*, *ai* either by the equivalent 𐬨—for which we often find 𐬨 *o* substituted by the neglect of copyists—or by the above mentioned 𐬨 *eu* which according to rule before a terminating 𐬨 *s* replaces the Indian ओ *o*.

\* But see § 447 Note



so that a termination in  $\text{𐬀𐬌} \text{ô} s$  is unheard of in the Zend. For the Viddhi diphthong  $\text{𐬀𐬌} \text{âu}$  (out of  $\text{â} + u$ ) we generally find  $\text{âo}$ , for which there is a special character  $\text{𐬀𐬌}$ , more rarely  $\text{𐬀𐬌} \text{âu}$ . It would appear that  $\text{𐬀𐬌} \text{âu}$ ,  $\text{𐬀𐬌} \text{âô}$ ,  $\text{𐬀𐬌} \text{âu}$ , and the  $\text{𐬀𐬌} \text{ô}$  which replaces  $\text{𐬀𐬌} \text{ê}$ , should be pronounced as diphthongs, *i.e.* as monosyllables.

34. Anuswâra and Visarga do not exist in Zend, unless we admit the nasal specified in § 61 as answering to the sound of the Sanskrit Anuswâra. We proceed meanwhile, for the present, to the proper consonants. The first letter of the Sanskrit guttural class has divided itself into two characters bearing reference to different functions,  $\text{𐬀}$  and  $\text{𐬀}$ , of which the first, which we represent by  $k$ , only appears before vowels and  $\text{𐬀} v$ , the other, which we write  $c$ , precedes especially consonants, excepting  $\text{𐬀} v$ . Compare, for instance,  $\text{𐬀} kô$ ,  $\text{𐬀} kâ$ ,  $\text{𐬀} kat$ , (*quis, quæ, quid*),  $\text{𐬀} hakêrêt$ , "once,"  $\text{𐬀} karôti$ , "he made,"  $\text{𐬀} kva$ , "where," with  $\text{𐬀} kô$ ,  $\text{𐬀} kâ$ ,  $\text{𐬀} kim$ ,  $\text{𐬀} sakrit$ ,  $\text{𐬀} karôti$ , and  $\text{𐬀} kva$  on the other hand,  $\text{𐬀} csathra$ , "king," with  $\text{𐬀} kshatra$ ;  $\text{𐬀} huti$ , "pouring out" (V S p 198), with  $\text{𐬀} sikti$  (from  $\text{𐬀} sich$ ). In what manner the pronunciation of this  $\text{𐬀} c$  differs from that of the  $\text{𐬀} k$  can indeed hardly be defined with certainty: it is probably softer, weaker than that of the  $\text{𐬀} k$ , which latter is fenced in by no strong consonants. Rask selects for it the character  $q$ , without observing that this letter prefers only to precede consonants, and in this position

[G Ed p 33] always corresponds to the Sanskrit  $\text{𐬀} k$ . Burnouf considers  $\text{𐬀}$  as an aspirate, and writes  $\text{𐬀} takmahê$ . He writes, on the other hand, the letter  $\text{𐬀}$ , which Rask treats as an aspirate, with  $q$ . Burnouf has not yet given his reason, which I think, however, I can guess, namely, that  $\text{𐬀} c$  is found before  $r$ , which, according to Burnouf's just

\*  $\text{𐬀} \text{ô} s$ , according to Burnouf, occurs occasionally as the termination of the genitive singular of the  $u$ -bases for the more common  $\text{𐬀} \text{eus}$ , *e.g.*  $\text{𐬀} bâzaôs$ , "brachû"

remark generally confers an aspirate upon a preceding consonant. I consider this reason, however as insufficient, and think that *œ* stands before *r*, because as we have before remarked all consonants *v* excepted only admit before them that modification of the *l* sound which is expressed by *œ*. It would be impossible for *r* and the other letters of similar agency to convey aspiration to the preceding hard guttural if *œ* *lh* be not extant in Zend so that for instance the root *खन्* *khan* to dig sounds *𐬕𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀* *lan* in Zend. There are however some words in which *œ* *lh* is represented by *œ*. From *𐬑𐬭𐬀* *khara* ass we find the accusative *𐬑𐬭𐬀𐬑𐬀* *carem* and we find also the *œ* *lh* of *𐬑𐬭𐬀* *sakhi* friend replaced by *c* the accusative for instance *𐬑𐬭𐬀𐬑𐬀* *sakhayām* transformed into *𐬑𐬭𐬀𐬑𐬀𐬑𐬀* *hacām*. It may therefore remain a question whether *𐬕* *l* or *œ* *c* in respect of their sounds have the better right to be referred to *œ* *lh* but this much is certain that *𐬕* *l* before vowels and before *œ* *v* is only represented by *𐬕* in Zend before other consonants only by *œ* which latter we shall till better advised continue to render by *c*.

35 Anquetil ascribes to *œ* the value of *œ* and to both the pronunciation *lh* while Rask considers the latter alone by reason of the aspiration stroke which he recognises as aspirated and compares it to the Spanish *x* and the Arabic *ح* and our German *ch*. Burnouf renders [G Ed p 34] *œ* by *q* and observes (l c p 345) that the Sanskrit syllable *स* *sua* becomes *qa* in Zend namely in *𐬑𐬭𐬀* *suapna* sleep written according to Burnouf *qafna* and in *𐬑𐬭𐬀* *(suus)*

this. We are inclined to add to these examples *𐬕𐬭𐬀* *khanha* (nom) accus *𐬕𐬭𐬀𐬑𐬀* *khanhrem* from *𐬑𐬭𐬀* *suasā* sister (soror) *𐬑𐬭𐬀𐬑𐬀* *suasāram* (sororem) and *𐬕𐬭𐬀𐬑𐬀* *kha rēno* splendour as related to *𐬑𐬭𐬀* *suar* heaven and *𐬑𐬭𐬀* *sur* to shine. We must however at the same time remark that *𐬑* *su* does not universally become *œ* *lh* and that *𐬑* *su* in particular in an isolated position and with a possessive signification much oftener appears in the shape of *𐬑𐬭𐬀* *ha*

or that of  $\text{هـ}$  *hava*. We render  $\text{هـ}$  by *kh*, and support our view of its aspiration more on the fact, that in modern Persian it corresponds frequently to  $\text{خ}$ , our *ch*, than on the circumstance that Rask has marked it as aspirated. This modern Persian  $\text{ح}$  is pronounced, indeed, at present, without aspiration, like an Italian *c* before *a*, *o*, *u*, but its value in Arabic, and the choice of this letter, so powerfully aspirated in the Arabic to designate a special guttural sound, in true Persian words, seems to indicate an intrinsic stronger or milder aspiration. As  $\text{هـ}$  *kh* is derived from the Sanskrit  $\text{ह}$  *su*, it was not applied to replace the  $\text{क}$  *k* before letters, which would without it produce an aspiration. It may also be here convenient to remember that either *u* or *v* ( $\text{و}$ ) accompanies the Persian  $\text{خ}$  when the latter replaces at the beginning of a

[G Ed p 35] word the Sanskrit  $\text{ह}$  *sw*. It is true that *v* is no longer sounded before long vowels, but it must originally have had its influence on the pronunciation, and cannot have been introduced into writing entirely without object, and for the mere employment of the copyist. Compare  $\text{خدا}$  *khudâ*, "God," with  $\text{स्वदत्ता}$  *swadatta*, "self-given," for which, in Zend, we have, under a more regular participial form (see Gramm. Crit. i 608),  $\text{खदाता}$  *khadâta*, which Anquetil, or his Pârsî teacher, always understands in the sense of, "given through God," deceived, probably, by the resemblance of sound to  $\text{خدا}$  *khudâ*, while Nirosengh properly translates it by  $\text{स्वयन्दत्ता}$  *swayandatta*. The Persian  $\text{خدا}$  *khudâ* is, however, as Burnouf correctly assumes, actually related to the Zend  $\text{खदाता}$  *khadâta*, so as to have its name based in the idea, "created by itself," while in its form it has been mutilated of one syllable. In Sanskrit we find both  $\text{सुभू}$  *suabhû*, "self-existent," and also the more common  $\text{स्वयम्भू}$  *swayambhû*, as appellations of Brahma and Vishnu. That, however, as has often been maintained, our word "God" is really related to

\* This word comes from the root *dhâ*, "to place," not from *dâ*, "to give," see § 637

حدا *I hudd* and that its primal signification has thus been discovered through the Zend we are forced still to doubt We will here only call to mind that the Germanic forms especially in the older dialects, in general approximate much more to the Sanskrit than to the modern Persian सू *su* is particular in the Gothic either remains unaltered or becomes *sl* (§ 20) The pronominal syllable स *sua* exhibits itself in the Gothic as a pronominal adverb *sia* (*so*) thus and with an instrumental form *sui* (*wie*) how The neuter substantive *suis* (Theme *suisa*) means *Eigenthum* property as in Sanskrit the neuter स *sua* I know of no certain form in which a Germanic *g* or *k* corresponds to a Sanskrit स *sw* or a Persian ح *kh* To return however to the [G Ed p 38] Persian ح *kh*<sub>u</sub>=स *sw* compare حقن *khustan* to sleep with ساق *suap* خواب *kh(u)ab* sleep with साथ *saupa* خواندن *kh(u)indan* to sing with سن *suan* to sound خواهر *ll(u)dhar* sister with सम *suasri* Gothic *sistar* خورشید *khur shid* sun Zend هار *hare* with سر *swar* heaven In some words ح *kh* corresponds to a Sanskrit *k* before *r* in which position the Zend loves an inspiration in the modern Persian, however a vowel intrudes between the guttural and the *r* thus خرامیدن *khirdm idan* to proceed with pomp corresponds to the Sanskrit क्रम *kram* to go to step, and خریدن *khuridan* to buy to the Sanskrit equivalent root क्री *kri* The Persian ح *kh* answers to the Sanskrit aspirated सू *lh* in the word حر *lhar* ass (Sanskrit सर *khara*)

36 The guttural  $\kappa$  and its aspirate  $\chi$  are represented by  $\kappa g$  and  $\chi gh$ . The Sanskrit  $\chi gh$  has however sometimes dismissed the aspiration in Zend at least  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\alpha\upsilon$  *garema* heart (*θερμη* and *Harne*) answers to the Sanskrit  $\chi\mu$  *gharma* on the other hand the  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\eta\alpha$  in  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\eta\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  *verethraghna* victorious corresponds to the Sanskrit  $\mu ghna$  at the end of compounds for instance in  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\eta\alpha$  *satru ghna* enemy slayer. The Zend  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\eta\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  *verethraghna* properly signi-

fies, like the word so often used in the same sense *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀* *vērēthra-zan*, "killer of Vritra," and proves a connection between the Zendish and Indian mythologies, which, however, in consequence of the obscuration of meanings in Zend, and the oblivion of the old Myths, now only exists in affinities of speech "Killer of Vritra" is one of the most usual titles of honour of the prince of the lesser gods, or Indra, who, from his slaughter of the dæmon Vritra, of the race of the Dā-  
[G Ed p 37] nawas, bears this name

We shall discuss the nasals apart in § 60.

37. Of the Sanskrit palatals the Zend has only the *tenues*; namely *𐬀* *ch* (= च्), and the *media*, namely *𐬀* *j* (= ज्) the aspirates are wanting, which is not surprising, as they are of rare occurrence in the Sanskrit The following are examples *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *charanti*, "he goes," Sanskrit *चरन्ति* *charanti*; *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬀* *chathuāro*, "four" (nom plu. mase.) Sanskrit *चत्वारि* *chatu āras*, *चत्वारो* *chatuāro*; *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *aōjō*, "strength," Sanskrit *ओजस्* *ōjas*, *ओजो* *ōjō* It is, however, to be observed, that, while the Sanskrit *ch* remains, by rule, unaltered in Zend, the sonant *j* is often replaced by other letters, and first, by *𐬀* *z*; for instance, *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *zāta*, "born," Sanskrit *जात* *jāta*; secondly, by *𐬀* *sh*, for instance, *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *shēnu*, "knee," Sanskrit *जानु* *jānu*

38 The modification of the sounds of *t*, peculiar to the Sanskrit, contained in the third row of consonants, is wanting in the Zend We pass, therefore, to the ordinary sounds of that letter, the dentals These are, *𐬀* *t* (त्), *𐬀* *th* (थ्), *𐬀* *d* (द्ध्) *𐬀* *dh* (ध्), together with a *𐬀* *t* (त), peculiar to the Zend, of which more hereafter The *𐬀* *t* is like the guttural which we represent by *k* (ग्), in this respect, that its position is almost limited to one preceding vowels Before *𐬀* *r* and *𐬀* *w*, and sometimes before *𐬀* *y*, in order to gratify the affection of the latter for an aspirate, the aspirated *𐬀* *th* steps in. Thus, for instance, *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *thuanīm* signifies "thee," while the nominative is written *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *tūm*, and the genitive *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *tava*, and the word *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *ātā*, "fire," nom *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀*

*ātan* s makes after rejection of the *a* which preceded *r* *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀* *āthrē* *igni* 𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 *āthrāt* *ab igne* &c If however the *t* be protected by a preceding consonant excepting *n* the succeeding semi vowel is thereby de [G Ed p 38] prived of its retro active power We find for instance 𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 *vastra* not 𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 *vasthra* garment vest but we have 𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 *manthra* speech not 𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 *mantra* from the root 𐬀𐬵𐬭 *man* At the end of a word and which rarely occurs before strong consonants (§ 25) at the beginning also and middle of a word the Sanskrit *t* (𐬀) is represented by a special letter namely by 𐬀 which we with Burnouf write *t* but formerly wrote with a simple *t* undotted below because no change is possible with 𐬀 or 𐬀 Rask represents it by *th* because he recognises the sign of aspiration I am unable however to assent to the universal validity of this sign of Rask's and I incline to rejecting the aspirate, as in Sanskrit from the end of words We should also remember that the diphthong *e* is written 𐬀 as well as 𐬀 the last which prevails at the end of words with a stroke similar to that which distinguishes our 𐬀 from 𐬀 Before consonants for instance in the word 𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 *thāsho* the sounding of *th* would be more precarious than that of *t* in case this *th* did not somewhat partake of a sibilant sound I think however that 𐬀 *t* has merely a feebler pronunciation than 𐬀 *t* and is so to say the last breathing of *t* as in Sanskrit *s* and *r* at the end of words are diluted to Visarga (§ 11) and as 𐬀 *t* in Prakrit and also in Greek is at the end of words altogether suppressed

39 𐬀 is the ordinary *d* 𐬀 and 𐬀 according to Rask's just remark its aspirate *dh* This represents the Sanskrit 𐬀 *dh* for instance in the imperative ending 𐬀𐬵 The Zend moreover favours 𐬀 *dh* for 𐬀 *d* in the middle of words between two vowels We find for instance 𐬀𐬵𐬭 *data* given but 𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 *dadhāmi* Sanskrit 𐬀𐬵𐬭 *dadāmi* I give and 𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 *mazda dhāta* [G Ed p 39]



semi vowel is written at the beginning of words by  $\text{u}$  or  $\text{u}$  and in the middle by the duplication of the  $\text{u}$   $\text{uu}$  as in the Old High German we find  $\text{u}$  expressed. This semi vowel and the vowels which correspond to it  $\text{a}$  and  $\text{i}$  introduce into the preceding syllable an  $\text{a}$  an interesting phenomenon first observed by Burnouf (l c pp 340 341) and which in its principle is connected with the German vowel modification (§ 73). We are obliged to ascribe a similar influence also to the diphthong  $\text{e}$  where it stands at the end of a word. Frequent occasion for this presents itself in the dat sing and the third pers pres of the middle verb. For instance  $\text{narai}$  *naire homini* for  $\text{nare}$  is frequent but  $\text{naraēcha}$  *homini* is an exception. The vowels after which by the attractive power of the letters mentioned an  $\text{a}$  is placed are  $\text{a}$   $\text{u}$   $\text{e}$   $\text{o}$  as to which we must also observe that  $\text{u}$  in the case of a succeeding  $\text{i}$  is lengthened. Examples are  $\text{madhya}$  (मध्य *madhya*) middle  $\text{nairya}$  मान *nairya* man  $\text{bavanti}$  बवन्ति he is  $\text{dadhāti}$  ददधाति he gives  $\text{ātāpayati}$  अतापयति he shines  $\text{kerenoti}$  करेनोति he makes  $\text{studhi}$  स्तुधि praise instead of  $\text{studhi}$  from the root  $\text{stu}$  (स्तु)  $\text{turya}$  तुर्य the fourth from  $\text{chatar}$  चतुर् with the  $\text{cha}$  suppressed \*  $\text{āhurya}$  आहुर्य an adjective derived from  $\text{ahura}$  अहुर. With regard to the influence of  $\text{y}$  we must observe that it does not mix up in  $\text{a}$  with a vowel immediately preceding but only with one separated from it by one consonant for if there be two unless the first be  $\text{n}$  the retroactive power of  $\text{y}$  or  $\text{i}$  is neutralized thus  $\text{asti}$  not  $\text{aisti}$ , stands for he is on the other hand we have  $\text{bhavanti}$  भवन्ति Sansk  $\text{bhavanti}$  they are. Several other consonants also resist simply [G Ed p 41] this power of attraction thus we have  $\text{dalhyu}$  not

Or more immediately from the Sanskrit ordinal तुर्य *turyya* or तुर्य *turiya* fourth —Editor



दाक्ष्यं *daikhya*, "land," "province", and the *r* of the personal terminations *मि* *mi* and *हि* *hi*, or *शि* *shi*, obtain no influence over the preceding syllable. In the same manner, in the first person plural, *महि* *mahi*, not *महि* *mahi*, corresponds to the Veda termination *मसि* *masi*, and in the genitive of the stems, or inflective bases, in *अ* *a*, *अह* *a-hé*, not *अह* *ahé*, stands for *अस्य* *a-sya*

42 *y* sometimes also exerts that disturbing influence on a following *a* or *á*, which is equivalent to the insertion of a vowel, or of *r*, and consequently effects their transmutation into *é*\*, thus the bases of nouns in

\* The expression of the text is ' *ansert umlautenden Einfluss*.' It is hardly possible to render into English without circumlocution certain terms which the philologists of Germany have invented and adopted to express the various modifications of the Indo-Germanic vowel, such as, *Ablaut*, *Anslaut*, *Inlaut*, *Umlaut*. Whether these terms have in themselves the virtue of suggesting to a Teutonic ear the particular modification of the vowel to which they are respectively applied may be doubted; but if to the student and the teacher they answer the purpose of a *mnemotechnica*, their use is fully justified by the necessity of the case, and the practice of a language which possesses a singular and inexhaustible power of progress and adaptation to exigencies. In our language, it seems to us that the uncouthness of such compounds as Upsound, Off-sound, and In-sound, could hardly be compensated by any advantage to be derived from their use, and we therefore purpose, in the course of this work, where any of these terms occur in the original, to retain them in their German shape. Of these terms, *Ablaut* and *Umlaut* are those which chiefly, if not alone, are used by our author. *Inlaut* is, we believe, merely the Sanskrit *Guna*. The meaning of the two former, and their distinction from each other, may best be explained by the following extract from our author's excellent work the *Vocalismus*, p. 10

"I designate," he says, "by the term *Ablaut*, a change of the root vowel, which is distinguished from the *Umlaut* by the fact that it is not produced by the influence of the vowel of the termination; for *Umlaut* is a mere affection, disturbance (*Trübung*) of the primary sound, through which that sound becomes more homogeneous with the vowel of the termination, while in the *Ablaut*, without any recognised external cause, it makes room for another, and, in general, totally different sound, as in Gothic, *nima*, 'I take', *nam*, 'I took' I say, without any recognised external

யா *ya* form in the genitive யுய்ய *yé hé* instead of யுய்ய *ya hé* and with the verb the old Sanskrit *या* *ya* or *या* *yá* of the fourth and tenth classes in the present singular becomes *ये* *ye*. Compare *அதாபயம்* *átápayém*, *அதாபயே* *átápayéhi* *அதாபயே* *átapayeti* with the Sanskrit *आदायामि* *átápayāmi* *आदायसि* *átapayasí* *आदायति* *átápayati*. In the last syllable *யா* *ya* before *ε* *m* according to rule becomes *யி* *i* and after the same analogy *யாம்* *iam* becomes *யும்* *um*. We find therefore for instance *தூரம்* *turim* *quartum* from *தூர* *turi* *rya* and *தேயம்* *thrishum* *tertiám partem* *தேயம்* *chathrushum* *quartam partem* from *தேய* *thrishva* *யம்* *chathrusha*. This appearance is to be thus understood that the antecedent semi vowel after the suppression of the *a* passes into its corresponding vowel which however according to the rule of § 64 must be a long one. The *ய* *y\** after its influence has transformed *a* into *e* is often itself suppressed thus we find *புரடாசைம்* *frádaśaēm* I shewed from *புரடையம்* *pradesayam* which

ternal cause because I think I can shew that the *Ablaut* also is produced by the particular quality and condition of the termination. Whether however we seek for the radical vowel in the present or the preterite the change is equally one quite different from that of the Indian *Guna* or *Viddhi* and in this respect that it is a positive change while in Sanskrit the root vowel is not in fact changed but only receives an increment, and that increment always one and the same with which it diphthongizes itself as in Greek *ε* and *υ* with *λ* *π* *φ* *χ* *γ* *κ*. In respect of signification likewise there is a difference between the Indian *Guna* and *Viddhi* and Germanic *Ablaut*, for the *Ablaut* has acquired for itself a signifiatory power for grammatical purposes even if as I conjecture it did not originally possess such the contrast between the present and the past seems to rest upon it and there are indications that the latter is expressed by this change. In Sanskrit *Guna* and *Viddhi* present no indication of this signifiatory power but merely in the character of diphthongizing modifications accompany those inflections which do signify grammatical relations.

Further illustrations of these latter remarks are to be found in the Note 1 which Professor Bopp has appended to the above passage of the *Vocalismus* — *Trans*

\* Cf p 963 Note.

according to the rule of the tenth class, would be formed from दिश् *dis'*. The genitive termination स्य *ya* appears everywhere reduced into ह्य *hé*. The semi-vowels य *y* and व *v* are generally suppressed after preceding consonants<sup>\*</sup>, and thus, also, the imperative ending स्वा *siva* gives up its *v*.

43 In Sanskrit, य *y* is sometimes, for euphony, interposed between two vowels (Gram. Crit. rr. 271. 310. 311), but this does not uniformly occur. In Zend, the interposition of *y* between *u*, *i*, and a following *é*, seems to amount to a law. Thus the Sanskrit ब्रूवे *bruvé*, "I say" (from ब्रू and वृ, Gram. Crit. 1. 55), becomes, in Zend, म्रुय्वे *mriúyé* (§ 63), and the neuter form द्वे *dué*, "two," after the vocalization of the *v* into *u*, takes the form म्रुय्वे *driúyé*.

44. We have already remarked (§ 30) with respect to *r*, that at the end of a word an *é* is always appended to it, for instance, दातारै *dātārē*, "Creator," "Giver," हवारै *hvarē*, "Sun," instead of दातार *dātār*, हवार *hvar*. In the middle of a word, where an *h* is not introduced according to § 48, the union of *r* with a following consonant is mostly avoided, so, indeed, that to the originally vowelless *r* an *é* is appended thence, for instance, दादारेषा *dadarēša*, from दादारीषा *dadarīša*, "vidi," "vidit", or the *r* is transposed, in the same manner as is usual in the Sanskrit for the avoidance of the union of र *r* with two following consonants (Gram. Crit. r. 34<sup>b</sup>). Hence, for instance, अथ्रवा *āthraṇā*, "priests" (nominative), accus. अथ्रवानेम *āthraṇānem*, from the theme अथ्रवान *āthraṇāvan*, which in the weak cases (§ 129) contracts itself into अथ्रुन *āthrun* or अथ्रुन *āthrun*. (§ 28.) To this, also, pertains the fact that polysyllabic stems (or uninflected bases) in *ar*, at the beginning of compounded forms, transpose this syllable into *ra*, and thus अथ्रवा *āthra*, "fire," stands instead of

<sup>\*</sup> But see § 721

𐬀𐬚𐬌 *athar* \* The combinations 𐬀𐬚 *ry* [G Ed p 43] 𐬀𐬚 *uri* are only permitted where *i* vowel follows and the combination 𐬀𐬚 *ars* only as a termination and in the middle of a word before *t* for instance 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *tihrya* the fourth 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *airya* strong 𐬚𐬀𐬚𐬚 *urian* soul 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚 *haurva* whole (?) 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚 *atars* fire (nominative) 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚 *nars* of a man 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *larsta* ploughed but 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *chathrus* four times for 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *chathurs* since here no *a* precedes the *rs*

45 It is worthy of remark that in the Zend the *l* is wanting as in Chinese the *r* while nevertheless it exists in the modern Persian and shews itself in words which are not of Semitic origin. The Sanskrit *ṛ* *v* has three representatives in the Zend 𐬚 » and 𐬛. The two first are so far distinguished from each other in their use that 𐬚 corresponds to the Sanskrit *v* only at the beginning and » only in the middle of words for instance 𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *iaēm* we = 𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *īayam* 𐬀𐬚𐬚𐬚 *tava* (tu) = 𐬚𐬚 *tava*. This distinction as Rask justly assumes is only graphic 𐬛 which I with Burnouf render by *u* most frequently occurs after *th* so that » never accompanies an antecedent *th*. On the other hand we find » much oftener than 𐬛 after the aspirated medials of this class. Perhaps the law here obtains that the *dh* which according to § 39 stands for *d* (𐬚) is only followed by » while in original *dh* corresponding to a Sanskrit *ṛ dh* only appears in conjunction with 𐬛. Thus 𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *dauhido* having created given from the root 𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *dh*† answers to the Sanskrit nom 𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *daduán* while the accusative of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad 𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *adhuānem* seems to be identical with the Sanskrit 𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚𐬚 *adhuānam* *īam* (Vend Olsh p 18) After other consonants than

\* By *Stamme* the author here evidently means the crude derivative words which serve as Stems or Bases to inflected words or those in combination with inflectional terminations, thus *athra* for *athar* forms *athraia* *athraian* in not *atharia* *atharianam* &c.—*I* *dilor*

† The root corresponds to the Sanskrit *d* *d* see § 37



priate than the harder » *v* The only example of this case is the feminine *ਸੁਰਦਾ* *surda* sword dagger,\* in which we believe we recognise the Sanskrit *सुभ्रा* *subhṛa* shining \* As to the pronunciation of the *œ* *u* I think with Burnouf that it accords with the English *u* which also is akin to the Sanskrit *वृ* *v* after consonants Rask reverses the powers pronouncing the Zend *œ* as the English *v* and the letters *h* and » as the English *ir*

46 I have not detected in the *v* and *w* a power of attraction similar to that which belongs to the *y* as described in § 41 unless the term *ਹਾਊਰਾ* *haurā* all which often occurs as well as *ਸਾਧਾ* *sāḥa* is derived from the Sanskrit *सर्व* *sarva* all I have however already else where ascribed to the corresponding vowel *u* a power of attraction howbeit sparingly exerted in virtue of which for instance the base *ਪ੍ਰਾਹੁਰਾ* *prāhura* priests in the work cases (see § 129) after that *ਪ੍ਰਾਹੁ* *prāhu* has contracted itself into *ਪ੍ਰਾ* *prā* by the influence of this *u* also converts the *a* of the preceding syllable into *u* hence for instance in the dative *ਪ੍ਰਾਹੁਰਾ* *prāhura* for *ਪ੍ਰਾਹੁਰਾ* *prāhura* The Sanskrit *प्रारु* *taruna* 'young' is in Zend *ਪ੍ਰਾਹੁਰਾ* *prāhura* or *ਪ੍ਰਾਹੁਰਾ* *prāhura* (§ 28) and *ਵਸੁ* *vasu* thing riches

[G Ed p 46] has by the influence of the concluding *u*, converted itself into *ਵਸੁ* *vasu*

47 Burnouf was the first to remark on the fact peculiar to the Zend that the semi vowels are fond of communicating an aspiration to a preceding consonant, and we (§ 40) have ascribed a similar influence to *ਸ* *s* and *ਯ* *y* and find ourselves compelled to assign the same also to the

\* The accusative *ਸੁਰਦਾ* *surdam*, appears in Olshausen, p 13 with the variation *ਸੁਰਦਾ* *surdam* (§ 40) Then we often find the instrumental *ਸੁਰਦਾ* *suraya* for which, however we must read *ਸੁਰਦਾ* *suraya* if *suraya* be not derivable from a Theme *ਸੁਰਦਾ* *surda* after the analogy of *ਸੁਰਦਾ* *sundari*, from *ਸੁਰਦਾ* *sundara* (Gramm Crit r 270)

labial nasal, by which, for instance, the feminine participle *ਜਗਮੁਸ਼ੀ jagmushī* has changed itself to *ਜਗਮੁਸ਼ੀ jaghmūshī*. The dental medial is free from this influence, for we find *ਦੁਆ dva*, "two," *ਦਰੁਦ drucs*, "a demon," (accus *ਦਰੁਦ drūjem*), not *ਦਰੁਦ dhruucs*, *ਦਰੁਦ dhruyēm*. The guttural medial is, however, exposed to this influence, as in the abovementioned instance of *jaghmūshī*. We have, on the other hand, adduced, in § 38, a limitation of this appearance. The aspirating virtue of the *ਯ y* is less potent than that of the *ਰ r* and *ਨ n*, and we find *y* often preceded by the unaspirated *t*, for instance, in *ਬਿਧਾ biṭya*, "the second," *ਤਿਧਾ thitya*, "the third" on the other hand, we have *ਮੌਰਿਥੁ mēṛēthyu*, "death," Sansk *ਮੌਰਿਥੁ mṛityu*.

48 In connection with the above rule stands the phenomenon, that before *r*, when followed by any consonant not a sibilant, an *h* is usually placed, for instance *ਮਾਰਿ ਮਾਰਿ mar* (ਮੌ ਮੌ, "to die", *ਕੇਰਿ ਪੇਮ keṛi pēm*, or *ਕੇਰਿ ਪੇਮ kēṛēpēm*, "the body" (nom *ਕੇਰਿ ਪੇਮ kēṛēfs*), *ਵੇਰਿ ਹਾ ਵੇਰਿ ha*, or *ਵੇਰਿ ਹਾ vēṛēha*, "wolf," (ਵੌ *vika*). The semi-vowel *y* also, which only appears before vowels, sometimes attracts an *h*, thus, *ਥਿਵਾਥਾ thivahya*, "through thee," corresponds to the Sanskrit *तव्या twayā*, and the word *ਸਾਧਾ saḥya* (nom *ਸਾਧਾ saḥya*

[G Ed p 47] *saḥyā* adduced by Rask, stands for *ਸਾਧਾ saḥya* and comes from the root *ਸਾਧਾ sa*, "to rule," (ਫੌ *lsh.*)

49 We come now to the sibilants. The first, a palatal, pronounced in Sanskrit with a gentle aspiration, *ਸ਼*, which we express by *ś* in Sanskrit, and *š* in Zend, is written *ਸ* in the latter. Its exact pronunciation is scarcely ascertainable. Anquetil assigns it that of the ordinary *s*. It in general occurs in those positions in which the Sanskrit in corresponding words has its *ਸ਼ ś*, thus, for instance, *ਦਾਸਾ daśa*, "ten," *ਸਾਤਾ sāta*, "hundred," *ਪਾਸੁ paśu*, "beast," are common to both languages. In this respect *ਸ* *ś* has spread itself wider in Zend than in Sanskrit, that before several consonants,

namely *t* *g* *h* and *j* *n* as well at the beginning as in the middle of words—in the latter place however only after *a* *ā* and *an*—it corresponds to the Sanskrit dental or ordinary *s* स. Compare *starō* the stars with *staras* *stāmi* I praise with *stāmi* *asti* he is with *asti* *astanm* *ossium* with *asthi* *shanda* shoulder (?) with *shandha* *snd* to purify with *sua* to bathe. We might infer from this circumstance that *s* *ā* was pronounced as a simple *s* yet it may have to do with a dialectical preference for the sound *sh* as happens with the German *s* in the Suabian dialect, and pretty universally at the beginning of words before *t* and *p*. It is further to be remarked that *s* *ā* occurs also at the end of words after *an*. The occasion for this presents itself in the nom. sing. masc. of bases in *nt*.

50 The semi-vowel *u* is regularly hardened into *p* after *s* hence for instance *spa* *canis* *spunem* *canem* *vispa* all [G. Ed. p. 48] *aspa* horse corresponding to the Sanskrit *asud* *śudānam* विश्व *visva* अश्व *asua* *spenta* holy is not corresponded to by a Sanskrit *śwanta* which must have originally been in use and which the Lithuanian *szanta* *s* indicates. From the Zend *aspa* the transition is easy to the Greek *ἵππος* which is less obvious in the case of the Indian *asua*.

51 For the Sanskrit lingual sibilant *ś* *sh* the Zend supplies two letters *sh* and *sh*. The first according to Rask is pronounced like the ordinary *s* and therefore like the Sanskrit dental *s* स while *sh* has the sound of *ś* = *sh* and marks this by a stroke of aspiration. We therefore write it *sh* \*. Rask observes that these two letters are often interchanged in MSS. which he accounts for by the circumstance

It is in this Translation given *sh* without any mark. *Sh* denotes the Sansk. *ś*.



that 𐬯 is used in the Pehlevi for *sh*, and that the Parsi copyists have been long better acquainted with the Pehlevi than the Zend. We find, also, in the Codex edited by Burnouf, 𐬯 almost everywhere corresponding to 𐬥 *sh*. We recognise, however, from the text edited by Olshausen of a part of the Vendidad, and the variations appended, that although in etymological respects 𐬯 as well as 𐬥 corresponds to the Sanskrit 𑖬 *sh*, the principal position of 𐬯 is before strong consonants (§. 25.) and at the end of words, a position of much importance in the Zend, and which requires attention in the cases of other classes of letters. In this respect 𐬯 resembles, among the dentals, 𐬢 *t*, among the gutturals 𐬭 *c*, and among the nasals principally 𐬮 *n*. At the end of words, indeed, 𐬯 *s* corresponds to the Sanskrit 𑖬 *s*, but yet

[G. Ed. p. 49] only after such letters as, in the middle of a word, would, according to Rule 101(\*) of my Sanskrit Grammar, change an original 𑖬 *s* into 𑖬 *sh*, namely, after vowels other than *a* and *ā*, and after the consonants 𐬭 *c* and 𐬢 *t*. Hence, for instance, the nominative 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *partis*, "Lord," 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *pašus*, "beast," 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *âtars*, "fire," 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *drucs*, "dæmon," from the theme 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬀 *drug*. On the other hand, 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀 *barans*, "bearing," from 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬀 *barant*.\* In the word 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *csras*, "six," it is true a terminating 𐬯 *s* stands after *a*, but it does not here replace a Sanskrit 𑖬 *s*, but the original 𑖬 *sh* of 𑖬𑖬 *shash*. As evidence of the use of 𐬯 *s* for 𑖬 *sh* before strong consonants, we may adduce the very usual superlative suffix 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀 *ista* (i e ἰστος), corresponding to the Sanskrit 𑖬𑖬 *ishtha*. Other examples are 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *karsta*, "ploughed," for 𑖬𑖬 *krishita*. In the word 𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *sayana* "camp," 𐬯 stands irregularly for 𐬮 *s*, which latter was to be anticipated from the Sanskrit 𑖬𑖬𑖬 *śayana* (cf. *śaētē*, §. 54). In the fem. numeral

\* I retain here the original *t*, since the theme of the word does not appear in use. 𐬢 *t* must otherwise have been changed for 𐬢 *t*.

𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *tisarō* three (Olsh p 26) the *u* might seem questionable for the Sanskrit form is 𑖔𑖑𑖔 *tisras* and according to § 53 becomes *u* *h*. The *s* however is here in a position (after *ṛ*) in which the Sanskrit favours the conversion of *s* into *sh* and on this rests the Zend form 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *tisarō*. That it does not however stand as 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *tisharo* as we might expect from § 52 is certainly not to be ascribed to the original existence of *u* *a* for 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *tisaro* stands for 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *tisrō*.

52 𐬔𐬀 stands for the Sanskrit *ś* *sh* be [G Ed p 50] before vowels and the semi vowels *y* and *v*, compare 𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *aetāshanm* and 𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *aetāshva* with 𑖀𑖔𑖑𑖔 *etesham* *horum* and 𑖀𑖔𑖑𑖔 *eteshu* in *his*, 𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *mashya* *man* with 𑖀𑖔𑖑𑖔 *manushya*. Yet 𐬔𐬀 *sh* does not unite itself with an antecedent *c* but for the Sanskrit *ś* *sh* we find almost everywhere in Olshausen's text and without variation *cs* hence for instance 𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *csathra* king Sanskrit 𑖑𑖔𑖑𑖔 *śshatra* a man of the warlike or royal caste. The word of frequent occurrence 𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *cslnaōma* and the third person connected with it 𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *cslnaōmayēti* we must on a double ground reject and prefer the variation given at p 33 since *u* *s* here is prolonged as well by the preceding *c* as by the following *n*. It is however worthy of remark that the Sanskrit *ś* *sh* in many Zend words abandons the guttural and appears as 𐬔𐬀 *sh*. For instance 𑖀𑖔𑖑𑖔 *dakshina* *dexter* becomes 𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *dashina* (Lithuan *desine* the right hand) and 𑖀𑖔𑖑𑖔 *akshi* eye becomes 𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *ashi* which however seems only to occur at the end of possessive compounds (Bahuvrīhi).

53 *u* *h* is never in etymological respects the representative of the Sanskrit *h* but of the pure and dental sibilant *ś*. Before vowels semi vowels and *m* in Zend this letter invariably becomes *u* possibly because *ś* *sv* (§ 35) takes the shape *śh* while before *n* and such consonants as cannot unite with a preceding *h* (§ 49) it is to be looked for in the shape of *u* *v*. The [G Ed p 51]

roots which begin with स् *sp* and स् *sph* have not yet been detected by me in the Zend, but I am convinced that स् *spriś*, for instance, "to touch," could not begin otherwise in Zend than with *sp* Compare, for instance

ZEND.	SANSKRIT
𐬵𐬀 <i>hā</i> , "they,"	सा <i>śā</i> .
𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 <i>hapla</i> , "seven,"	सप्त <i>sapta</i>
𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>hakēret</i> , "once,"	सकृत् <i>sakrit</i>
𐬵𐬀𐬀 <i>ah</i> , "thou art,"	असि <i>asi</i>
𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬀 <i>ahmān</i> , "to this,"	अस्मे <i>asmān</i>
𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>hvarē</i> , "sun,"	स्वर् <i>sva</i> , "heaven"
𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>hva</i> , "his,"	स्व <i>sva</i>

The word 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *hiva*, "tongue," from 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *jhuva*, deserves mention, because the sibilant quality of the *z* is treated as *s*, and replaced by *h* (§ 55)

54 I do not remember to have met with an instance of the combination *hr*, the Sanskrit word सहस्र *sahasra*, "thousand," which might give occasion for it, has rejected the sibilant in the last syllable, and taken the shape 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *hazama* If, in the word 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *huska*, "dry," Sansk शुष्क *śushka*, *h* replaces the Sansk श् *ś*, we must remember that the Latin *siccus* indicates a Sansk स *s*, because *c* regularly answers to श् *ś* In many instances of Sanskrit roots beginning with स् *s*, the corresponding Zend form may be grounded on the change which is effected on an initial स् *s* by the influence of certain prepositions (Gram Crit r 80.)

[G Ed p 52] Thus I believe I have clearly ascertained the existence of the Sanskrit participle सिद्ध *siddha*, "perfected," in the term of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shāistēm*, after the analogy of 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *mista*, "deceased," from 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀 *mrith* (see § 99) Olshausen notifies (p 29) as variations of 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shāistēm* 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *śāistēm*, 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shāistēm*, 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shāistēm*, and 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shāistēm* In all these forms, the long *a* presents a difficulty, for, according to § 28, सिध् *shudh* would give the form 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shardh*, and thus, with the suffix *ta*,

𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *shaista* in the nom and accus neut 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *sháistum* What Anquetil (vol II p 279) translates, *Juste juge du monde qui existe par votre puissance vous qui êtes la pureté même quelle est la première chose qui plaise à cette terre (que nous habitons) et la rende favorable* runs in the original (Olsh p 29 Burnouf p 137) 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *Datave gaethananam astrañinanam ashaum! kva paourim ah hao zemo sháistem? Creator mundorum existentium pure ubi (quid) primum hujus terræ perfectum (bonum? )*

55 The nominative pronominal base 𐬰𐬀 *syā* (Gramin Crit r 268) in the Veda dialect is under the influence of the preceding word and we see in Rosen's specimen p 6 this pronoun when it follows the particle 𐬰𐬀 converted into 𐬰𐬀 *shya* after the analogy of rule 101 of my Grammar I have detected a similar phenomenon in the Zend pronouns for we find 𐬰𐬀 *he* *ejus* *ei* which is founded on a lost Sanskrit 𐬰𐬀 *sē* (cf 𐬰𐬀 *me* *mei* *mih* and 𐬰𐬀 *tē* *tui* *tibi* ) when it follows 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *ye-* if taking the form 𐬰𐬀 *sē* (more correctly perhaps 𐬰𐬀 *shē*) for instance at p 37 of Olshausen while on the same page we find 𐬰𐬀 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *yē-icha hē* (und uenn ihm) [G Ed p 53] "and if to him" In the following page we find a similar phenomenon if as I can hardly doubt 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *shao* (thus I read it with the variation) corresponds to the Sanskrit 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *asdu* ( *ille illa* ) 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *Nout zi im zāo shāo ya* (text 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *yāo*) *dareghu akarsta* (text 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *adarsta*) For not this earth which lies long unploughed

56<sup>a</sup>) An *wh* standing between *a* or *u* and *i* following vowel is usually preceded by a guttural nasal (𐬀 *n*) and this appendage seems indispensable—I remember at least no exception—in cases where the following vowel is *a*, *u* or *e*. We find for instance 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬌 *usazayanha* thou wast born while in the active the personal ending *wh* of the present admits no nasal and we find for

instance, *अह्* *ah*, "thou art," *आसस्यह्* *baesah*, "thou givest," not *अह्* *anh*, *आसस्यह्* *baesanh*

56b). The termination *as*, which in Sanskrit is only before sonant consonants (§ 25) and *अ*, dissolves its *स* into *उ* *u*, and contracts the latter together with the preceding *a* into *ओ* *o* (compare the French *au*, from *al*). This ancient termination *as* appears in Zend, as also in Prâkrit and Pali, always under the shape of *o*. On the other hand, the termination *ās*, which in Sanskrit before all sonant letters entirely abandons the *s*, in Zend has never allowed the concluding sibilant entirely to expire, but everywhere preserves its fusion in the shape of *ओ* *o* (for [G Ed p 54] *u*), and I consider myself thereby strongly supported in a conjecture I enounced before my acquaintance with Zend,\* that in Sanskrit the suppression of a terminating *s* after *ā* had preceded the vocalization of this *s* into *u*. It is remarkable that where, in Zend, as above observed, an *न* *n* precedes the *ह* *h* which springs out of the *s* of the syllable *ās*, or where, before the enclitic particle *चा* *cha*, the *s* above mentioned is changed into *ओ* *o*, together with these substantial representatives of the *s*, its evaporation into *ओ* *o* is also retained, and the sibilant thus appears in a double form, albeit torpid and evanescent. To illustrate this by some examples, the Sanskrit *मास* *mās*, "luna" an uninflected nominative, for the *s* belongs to the root receives in Zend the form *माओ* *māo*, in which *o* represents the Sanskrit *s*, *माश्चा* *māś-cha*, "lunaque," gives us *माओश्चा* *māoścha*, and, *मासम्* *māsam*, "lunam," *माओन्हम्* *māonhēm*, so that in the two last examples the Sanskrit sibilant is represented by a vowel and a consonant. The analogy of *māonhēm*, "lunam," is followed in all similar instances, for example, for *आस* *āsa* "fuit," we find *आओन्हा* *āonha*, and for *आसाम्* *āsām*, "earum," *आओन्हाम्* *āonham*†

\* Observations, rule 78 of the Latin edition of Sanskrit Grammar

† Burnouf is of a different opinion as to the matter in question, for in the

57 Two sibilants remain to be mentioned namely  $\zeta$  and  $\psi$  of which the former was probably pronounced like the French  $z$  and may therefore be replaced [G Ed p 55] by that letter. Etymologically this letter answers to the Sanskrit  $ह h$  for the most part which never corresponds to the Zend  $h$ . Compare for example

SAN KRIT		ZEND
अहम् <i>aham</i>	I	𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 <i>a ěm</i>
हस्त <i>hasta</i>	hand	𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 <i>zasta</i>
सहस्र <i>sahasra</i>	thousand	𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 <i>ha-anra</i>
हन्ति <i>hanti</i>	he strikes	𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 <i>zanti</i>
वहति <i>vahati</i>	he carries	𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 <i>vazanti</i>
	bears	
हि <i>hi</i>	for	𐬀𐬭𐬀
जिह्वा <i>jihvā</i>	tongue	𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 <i>hi va</i> (§ 53)
महात् <i>mahat</i>	great	𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 <i>ma-ō</i> (from <i>mazas</i> acc. 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 <i>ma-anhim</i> )

58 Sometimes  $\zeta$   $z$  appears also in the place of the Sanskrit  $ज j$  so that the sibilant portion of this letter pronounced *dsch* is alone represented and the *d* sound suppressed (see § 53). Thus  $\zeta$ 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *yaz* to adore answers to the Sanskrit  $यज् yaj$  𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *zaōsha* to please springs from the Sanskrit root  $जुष् jush$  to please or gratify. Thirdly the Zend  $z$  represents also the Sanskrit  $ग g$  which is easily accounted for by the relationship between  $g$  and  $j$ . The Indian  $gō$  (accus. *gām*) *bos* and *terra* has in Zend as *al o* in Greek clothed itself in two forms the first

the Nouveau Journ. Asiatique tom. iii p. 342 speaking of the relation of *maonho* to *maranho* without noticing the analogies which occur in cases of repetition, *maosh cīa lunague urtaraosh-cha arboresque* "he says

In *mādongho* there is perhaps this difference, that the *ng* does not replace the Sanskrit  $स s$  for this letter has already become *o* in consequence of a change of frequent occurrence which we have lately noticed



other hand *av nā* (nom) man *noit* not *barayen* they might bear *anya* the other Concerning the difference between *y* and *ay*—a difference not recognised in European alphabets—it is probable that *ay* being always fenced in by strong consonants must have had a duller and more suppressed sound than the freer *y* and by reason of this weak and undecided character of its pronunciation would appear to have applied itself more easily to every organ of the following letter

61 Still feebler and more undecided than *ay* perhaps an equivalent to the Indian Anuswara, we conjecture to have been the nasal *ṣ* which is always involved with *av*, and which seems from its form to have been a fusion of *av* and *y*. We find this letter which we write *an* first before sibilants before *wh* like the Anuswara and before the aspirates *th* and *f* for instance *csayans regnans* *recus csayanti* *zanhyamāna* a part of the middle future of the root *zan* 'to beget,' but as it seems to me with a passive signification ( *qui nascetur* Vend S pp 23 and 103 ) *manthra* speech from the root *man* *janfnu* mouth probably from the Sanskrit *jan* to pry § 40 and with the nasal inserted Secondly, before a terminating *m* and *n*. We have here to observe that the Sanskrit termination *ām* is always changed to *anm* in Zend for instance *dadhanm* I gave Sanskrit *adadām* *pādhananm* *pedum* Sans *pādānām* and that the termination of the third person plural *an* provided the *a* do not pass into *ē* always appears as a double nasal *ann* \*

62 For the nasal which according to § 56 is placed as an euphonic addition before the *wh* which springs from *s* the Zend has two characters, *z* and *š* to both which

\* The termination *ann* from *an* belongs to the potential, precativ and subjunctive





The form in question is a contraction of the theme  $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} \text{ashavan}$ , with an irregular conversion of the concluding  $\text{𐬀} \text{n}$  into  $\text{𐬀} \text{m}$

65 We give here a complete summary of the Zend characters

Simple Vowels  $\text{𐬀} \text{a}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{ē}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{e}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{u}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{i}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{z}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{u}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{o}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{u}$

Diphthongs  $\text{𐬀} \text{w}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{ē}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{ē}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{u}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{d}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{d}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{u}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{d}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{u}$

Gutturals  $\text{𐬀} \text{h}$  (before vowels and  $\text{𐬀} \text{z}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{c}$  (principally before consonants)  $\text{𐬀} \text{h}$  (from  $\text{𐬀} \text{su}$  before vowels and  $\text{𐬀} \text{y}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{g}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{gh}$

Palatals  $\text{𐬀} \text{ch}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{j}$

Dentals  $\text{𐬀} \text{t}$  (before vowels and  $\text{𐬀} \text{y}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{t}$  (before consonants and at the end of words)  $\text{𐬀} \text{th}$  (before whole and semi vowels)  $\text{𐬀} \text{d}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{dh}$

Labials  $\text{𐬀} \text{p}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{f}$  (the latter before vowels semi vowels nasals and  $\text{𐬀} \text{z}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{b}$

Semi vowels  $\text{𐬀} \text{w}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{y}$  (the two [G Ed p 60] first initial the last medial)  $\text{𐬀} \text{z}$  (the last only after  $\text{𐬀} \text{f}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{v}$  (the first initial the last medial)  $\text{𐬀} \text{r}$

Sibilants and  $\text{h}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{s}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{sh}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{s}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{h}$  (or like the French  $\text{j}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{z}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{h}$

Nasals  $\text{𐬀} \text{n}$  (before vowels semi vowels and at the end of words)  $\text{𐬀} \text{n}$  (before strong consonants)  $\text{𐬀} \text{an}$  (before sibilants  $\text{𐬀} \text{h}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{th}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{f}$   $\text{𐬀} \text{m}$  and  $\text{𐬀} \text{n}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{n}$  (between  $\text{𐬀} \text{a}$  or  $\text{𐬀} \text{d}$  and  $\text{𐬀} \text{h}$  and between  $\text{𐬀}$  and  $\text{r}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{n}$  (between  $\text{𐬀} \text{i}$  or  $\text{𐬀} \text{ē}$  and  $\text{𐬀} \text{h}$ )  $\text{𐬀} \text{m}$

Remark also the Compounds  $\text{𐬀} \text{w}$  for  $\text{𐬀} \text{ah}$  and  $\text{𐬀} \text{w}$  for  $\text{𐬀} \text{st}$

66 We refrain from treating specially of the Greek Latin and Lithuanian systems of sounds but must here devote a closer consideration to the Germanic The Gothic  $\text{𐬀}$  which according to Grimm is always short answers

\* L g  $\text{𐬀} \text{h} \text{a} \text{a} \text{u} \text{ra}$  a thousand



have an example in which the Gothic Sanskrit *a* has become *i*

69 For the Sanskrit *अ* the Gothic which has no long *a* almost always substitutes *ō* (§ 4) and thus *ō* in cases of abbreviation, falls back into the short *a*. Thus for instance in Grimm's first fem declension of the strong form the nom and accus sing *o* is softened to *a* whence *giba*, *gibō-s* (§ 118). Generally in the Gothic polysyllabic forms, the concluding *अ* is shortened to *a* and where *ō* stands at the termination, an originally succeeding consonant has been dropped for instance, in the gen plur fem *ō* stands for *अम* *ām*. Sometimes also in the Gothic *ē* corresponds to the Sanskrit *ā* as in the gen plur masc and neuter. In the Old High German the Gothic *ō* either [G Ed p 62] remains *ō* as in the gen plur, or divides itself into two short vowels and according to differences of origin into *oa*, *ua* or *uo* of which in the Middle High German *uo* prevails while in the Modern High German the two divided vowels are contracted into *u*. For the Gothic *ē* = *अ* the Old Middle and Modern High German have preserved the old *a* except in the gen plural.

70 For *इ* and *ई* the Gothic has *i* and *e* which latter as Grimm has sufficiently shewn is everywhere to be considered as long *i* and also in Old and Middle High German is so represented. We, together with Grimm are in the case of the other vowels designate its prolongation by *i* circumflex. In the Modern High German the long *i* appears mostly as *e*. Compare for instance *mein* with the Gothic genitive *meina* and the Old and Middle High German *min*. Sometimes a short *i* is substituted, as in *lich* answering to the Gothic *leiks* like at the end of compounds. On the long *i*, in *uir* nos Gothic *weis* we can lay no stress as we match the dnt sing *mir* also with the Gothic *mis*. It is scarcely worth remarking that we usually in writing designate the elongation of the *i* and other vowels by the addition of *ui* *h*

71 While the original *अ* *a* has undergone many alterations in the Germanic languages, and has produced both *i* and *u*, I have been able to detect no other alterations in *i* and *u* than that *i* is as often suppressed as *a*, but it never happens, unless some rare exceptions have escaped me, that *i* is replaced by a heavier vowel *a* or *u*\*. We may lay [G Ed p 63] it down as a rule, that final *i* has given way in German everywhere, as it has generally in Latin. Compare.

SANSKRIT	GREEK	LATIN	GOthic
परि <i>pari</i> ,	περί,	<i>pei</i> ,	<i>fan</i> . (§ 82)
उपरि <i>upari</i> ,	ὑπέρ,	<i>super</i> ,	<i>ufan</i>
अस्ति <i>asti</i> ,	ἐστί,	<i>est</i> ,	<i>ist</i>
सन्ति <i>santi</i> ,	εἰστί,	<i>sunt</i> ,	<i>sind</i>

72 Where a concluding *i* occurs in Gothic and Old High German it is always a mutilation of the German *j* (or *y*) together with the following vowel, so that *j*, after the suppression of this vowel, has vocalized itself. Thus the uninflected Gothic accus *hari*, "*exercitum*," is a mutilation of *harya*†. The Sanskrit would require *harya-m*, and the Zend, after § 42., meeting the Germanic half way, *hari-m*. Before a concluding *s* also, in the Gothic, *zi* is usually suppressed, and the Gothic terminating syllable *is*, is mostly a weakening of *as*, § 67. In Old High German, and still more in Middle and Modern High German, the Gothic *i* has often degenerated into *e*, which, where it occurs in the accented syllable, is expressed in Grimm by *e*. We retain this character. We have also to observe of the Gothic, that, in the old text, *i*

\* The Sanskrit पित्रु *pitrū*, "*father*," probably stands for पितृ *pātrū*, "*ruler*", and the European languages have adhered to the true original (Gramm Crit r 178, Annot).

† In the text *harya*, but in order to shew more exactly the connection with the Sanskrit य *y*, vide § 68 l 12, and as the *j* is simply and universally pronounced *y*, the German *j* will be represented by *y* in this translation.

at the beginning of a syllable is distinguished by two dots above which Grimm retains

73 As in Zend (§ 41) by the attractive force of *i*, *ē*, or *y* an *i* is introduced into the antecedent syllable so also in Old High German the corresponding sounds have obtained an assimilating power and frequently an [G Ed p 64] *a* of the preceding syllable is converted into *e*, without any power of prevention on the part of either a single or double consonant Thus for instance we find from *ast* branch the plural *estē* from *anst* grace the plural *enstē*, and from *vallu* 'I fall, the second and third persons *vellis* *vellit* This law however has not prevailed the Old High German universally we find, for instance *arpi* *hereditas* not *erpi* *zahari*, *lacrymæ* not *zaheri*

74 In the Middle High German the *e* which springs from the older *i* has both retained and extended the power of modification and assimilation inasmuch as, with few limitations, (Grimm p 332,) not only every *a* by its retrospective action becomes *e* but generally, also *ā* *u* and *o* are modified into *æ* *u* and *o* *ō* into *æ* and *uo* into *ue* Thus the plural *gestē* *drate*, *bruche* *koche* *læne* *gruese* from *gast*, *drāt* *bruch*, *koch*, *lōn* *gruo*~ On the other hand in the Old High German the *e* which has degenerated from *i* or *ā* obtains no such power and we find in the genitive singular of the above words *gastē* *drate* &c because the Old High German has already in the declension of the masculine *i* class reduced to *e* the *i* belonging to the class and which in Gothic remains unaltered

75 The *e* produced in Old and Middle High German by the modification of *a* is retained in the Modern High German in cases where the trace of the original vowel is either extinguished or scarcely felt as *Ende* *Engel*, *set* *en* *netzen* *nennen*, *brennen* Goth *andi*, *aggilus* *satyan* *natyan* *namnyan* *brannyan* Where, however the original vowel is distinctly opposed to the change we place *u* short or

[G Ed p 65] long, from short or long *u*, and in the same relation, *u* from *u*, *o* from *o*, *au* from *au*, for instance, *Brunde*, *Pfale*, *Dunste*, *Fluge*, *Koche*, *Tone*, *Baume*, from *Brand*, *Pfal*, &c

76 For *u*, *û*, the Gothic has *u*, which is generally short. Among the few examples cited by Grimm, p. 11, of long *u*, we particularize the comparative *suðzô*, the essential part of which corresponds to the Sansk *सुद्ध सुद्ध*, "sweet," (*ṣṍḍu-s*), and in which the long *u* may stand as a compensation for the absence of the *u(v)*, which becomes vocalized. In Old High German it seems to me that *pûam*, "to dwell," and *trûin*, "to trust," correspond to the Sanskrit roots *भू bhû*, "to be," *धृ dhrû* "to stand fast" from which comes *ध्रु dhrûva*, "fast," "constant," "certain" (Gramm Crit r 51.) with the Guna form of which (§ 26) the Goth. *bauan*, *trauan*, is connected, cf *भवद्भु bhav-utum*, "to be," *ध्रुवद्भु dhrav-utum*, "to stand fast." The Middle High German continues the Gothic Old High German *û*, but the Modern High German substitutes *au*, whence *bauen*, *trauen*, *Taube* (Gothic *dilbô*).

77 As out of the Sanskrit *u*, in Zend, the sound of a short *u* has developed itself (§ 32), thus, also, the Gothic *u* shews itself, in the more recent dialects, oftener in the form of *o* than in its own. Thus have the Verbs in the Old and Middle High German (Grimm's 9th conjug) preserved a radical *u* in the plur of the pret., but replaced it by *o* in the passive part. Compare, for instance, *bugum*, "we bend," *bugans*, "bent," with Old High German *pukumês*, *pokanêr*, Middle High German *bugen*, *bogen*. The example adduced shews, also, the softening of the old *u* to *e*, in unaccented syllables, in Middle High German as in Modern High German, so that this unaccented *e* may represent all original vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, and we may lay it down as a rule, that all long and short vowels in the last syllable of poly

\* Cf §. 447 Note.

syllabic words, are either worn away or softened down to a mute *e*

78 For the diphthongs ए  $\acute{e}$  ( $a + i$ ) and ओ  $\acute{o}$  ( $a + u$ ) the Gothic has *ai* and *au* which are also monosyllabic and were perhaps pronounced like ए  $\acute{e}$  and ओ  $\acute{o}$ . Compare *bauma ædificemus* with भवेम *bhāwema* 'simus *sunau s* of a son with its equivalent सुनोस् *sunāḥ-s*. Where these Gothic diphthongs *ai* and *au* have maintained themselves unaltered in value they then appear in writing as  $\acute{e}$  and  $\acute{o}$ ,\* which must be considered as contractions of  $a + i$  and  $a + u$  as in the Latin *amēmus* from *amāimus* (§ 5) and as in the almost solitary case of *lōs* the long  $\acute{o}$  of which is the result of a contraction of  $a + u$ , whose latter element appears again before vowels in the independent shape of *u* (*hou* *houm*) while the first element  $\acute{a}$  in its degeneration, appears as *o* (§ 3). Compare

SANSKRIT	GOthic	OLD HIGH GERMAN
चरेम <i>charēma</i> ( <i>camus</i> )	<i>faraima</i>	<i>laremēs</i>
चरेत <i>chareta</i> ( <i>entis</i> )	<i>faraitih</i>	<i>varēt</i>
तेभ्यस् <i>tibhyas</i> ( <i>his</i> )	<i>thaim</i>	<i>dēm</i>

79 In like manner in all subjunctives and in the pronominal declension in which the adjective bases in *a* take part an Old High German  $\acute{e}$  corresponds to the Sanskrit ए  $\acute{e}$  and Gothic *ai*. The Middle High [G Ed p 67] German has shortened this  $\acute{e}$  as standing in an unaccented terminating syllable (*laren* *varēt*). Besides this the Middle High German has in common with the Old High German

If however the Gothic diphthongs in question were not pronounced like their etymological equivalents ए  $\acute{e}$  and ओ  $\acute{o}$  but, as Grimm conceives approximate to the Vriddhi change (§ 26) ऐ *ai* and औ *au* in such case the High German  $\acute{e}$   $\acute{o}$  as opposed to the Gothic *ai* *au* are not merely continuations of these Gothic diphthongs but the pronunciation assigned by the Sanskrit to the union of *a* with *i* or *u* must have been first introduced into the Germanic under certain conditions, in the eighth century



preserved the diphthong *ê* where it stood in radical syllables under the protection of a following *u*, *r* (out of the older *ɛ*), or *h* (*ch*), even in cases where one of these letters had been dropped, or where *u* had vocalized itself into *ɪ* or *o*. (Grimm. pp. 90-343). Compare,

GOTHIC	OLD	MIDDLE
	HIGH GERMAN	HIGH GERMAN
<i>au</i> , "ærum,"	<i>êu</i> <i>în</i>	
<i>snau</i> <i>s</i> , "nir,"	<i>snê</i> <i>o</i> ,	<i>snû</i>
<i>maiz</i> , "magis,"	<i>mêr</i> .	<i>mê</i>
<i>laisyan</i> , "docere,"	<i>lêian</i> .	<i>l'ren</i>
<i>larku</i> , "commodavit,"	<i>l'ih</i>	<i>l'ich</i>

In the Modern High German this *ê* is partly preserved, partly replaced, for instance, *mêr* (*mehr*), *Schnê* (*Schnee*), *Sêle* (Gothic *saiwala*), but *ich lieh*, *gedieh* (Grimm p. 983.)

80. As the *ê* for the Gothic *ai*, so the *ô* for *au*, in the Old and Middle High German, is favoured by certain consonants, and those which favour the *ô* are the more numerous. They consist of the dentals (according to the Sanskrit division, § 16.) *t*, *d*, *z*, together with their nasal and sibilant (*n*, *s*), further, the semi-vowel *r*, and *h*, which, as a termination in Middle High German, becomes *ch* (See Grimm, pp. 94. 345). The roots, which in the Gothic admit the Guna modification of the radical *u* by *a*, in the preterite singular, oppose to the Gothic *au*, in Middle and Old High German, a double form, namely, *ô* under the condition above mentioned, and next *ou*, § 34., in the absence

[G. Ed p 68] of the letter which protects *ô*. For instance, Old High German *zôh*, Middle High German *zôch* (*traai*, *tiarî*) Gothic *tau* *h*, Sanskrit दुदोह *dudôha* (*mulu*, *mulu*), but *pou*, *bouc*, *flexi*, *flexit*, Gothic *laug*, Sanskrit बुभोज *bu-bhôja*. The Modern High German exhibits the Gothic diphthong *au*, either, like the Middle and Old High German, as *ô*, and in a more extended degree, and subject to the modification of § 75, or next, shortened to *o*,

the particulars of which will be explained under the verb  
or thirdly as *ou* for instance *daupya* I baptize *hlaupa*  
I run or fourthly as *eu* § 83

81 As *Ulfilas* in proper names represents both *e* and *ai*  
by *oi* and likewise *o* and *au* by *au* (*Patrus, Galeilaa*  
*apaustaulus Paulus*) and *as* in the next place not every  
Gothic *oi* and *au* in the cognate dialects is represented in like  
manner but in some cases the Gothic *ai* is replaced in Old  
High German by a simple *i* or *e*, and *au* by *u* or *o* (§ 77)  
but in the others *oi* is replaced by *e* or (§ 80) by *ai* and  
*au* by *o* or (§ 81) *ou* therefore Grimm deduces from these  
facts a double value of the diphthongs *ai* and *au* one  
with the accent on the last element (*ai*, *au*) another with  
the accent on the *a* (*ai* *au*) We cannot however give im-  
plicit belief to this deduction of the acute author of the  
German system of sounds and prefer assuming an equal  
value in all cases of the Gothic *ai* and *au* although we  
might support Grimm's view by the fact that in Sanskrit  
ए and ओ never replace his *ai* and *au* but everywhere  
where occasion occurs do replace *ai* and *au* We think how-  
ever that the difference is rather phonetic than etymological  
As concerns the *oi* and *ou* in proper names it may be ac-  
counted for inasmuch as the Gothic was [G F I p 69]  
deficient in equivalents for these non primitive vowels which  
have degenerated from the original *ai* *au* Could *Ulfilas*  
have looked back into the early ages of his language and  
have recognised the original identity of *e* and *o* with his *a*  
he would perhaps have used the latter as their substitutes  
From his point of sight however he embraced the *ai* and  
*au* probably because these mixed diphthongs passed with  
him as weaker than the long *e* and *o*, *eiusdem generis* =  
(*ai* *o*) It is important here to observe that in Greek also  
\* *ai* is felt as weaker than *η* and *ω* as is proved by the fact  
that *ai* does not attract the accent towards itself (*τυπτομαι*  
not *τυπτομαι*) The expression of the Greek *oi* and *au* by

the Gothic *ai* and *au* requires the less justification, because even if *ai* was pronounced like  $\text{र } \acute{e}$ , and *au* like  $\text{ओ } \acute{o}$ , yet the written character presents these diphthongs as a still perceptible fusion of *a* with a following *i* or *u*.

82 As to the other statement, namely, that not every Gothic *ai* and *au* produces the same effect in the younger dialects, nor has the same foundation in the older Sanskrit, it might be sufficient to observe upon one feature of dialect peculiar to the Gothic, that *h* and *r* do not content themselves with a pure preceding *i*, but require it to be affected by Guna (§ 26.), thus, *ai* for *i*, and *au* for *u*, while other dialects exhibit the *i* and *u* before *h* and *r* in the same form as before every other consonant. The relation of the Gothic to their Sanskrit equivalents,

GOTHIC	SANSKRIT
<i>saihs</i> , "six,"	षष् <i>shash</i> ,
<i>taihun</i> , "ten,"	दशन् <i>daśan</i> ,
<i>faihu</i> , "cattle,"	पशु <i>paśu</i> ,
<i>svaihra</i> "father-in-law,"	श्वशुर <i>śvaśura</i> ,
<i>taihsvô</i> , "dextera,"	दक्षिणा <i>dakṣinā</i> ,
[G] <i>hartô</i> , "heart,"	हृद् <i>hṛd</i> (from <i>hard</i> § 1),
[Ed] <i>bairan</i> , "to bear,"	भर्तुम् <i>bhartum</i> ,
[P] <i>distanan</i> , "to tear,"	दरितुम् <i>dar-i-tum</i> ,
[70] <i>stai nô</i> , "stai,"	तारा <i>tārā</i> ,

is not so to be understood as though an *i* had been placed after the old *a*, but that, by the softening down of the *a* to *i* (§ 66), the forms *saihs*, *taihun*, had been produced, out of which, afterwards, the Guna power arising from *h* and *r* had produced *saihs*, *taihun*, *bairan*. The High German has, however, remained at the earlier stage, for Old High German *sehs*, (Anglo-Saxon, "six,") and *tehan* or *tehum*, &c, rest upon an earlier Gothic *saihs*, *taihun*. Thus, *tohtar* rests on an earlier Gothic *duhtar*, for the Guna form *dauhtar*, Sanskrit दुहितृ *duhitā*, (दुहितृ *duhitri*, §. 1) "daughter." Where the

Sanskrit *ai* has preserved itself in the Gothic unaltered that is not weakened to *i* the occasion is absent for the development of the diphthong *ai*, since it is not the *a* before *h* and *r* which demands a subsequent addition but the *i* which demands a precedent one, compare *ahtau*, eight with *अष्टौ ashtau* \*

83 The alterations to which the simple vowels have been subjected appear again in the simple elements of the diphthongs as well in the relation of the Gothic to the Sanskrit as in that of the younger Germanic dialects to the Gothic. Thus the *a* element of the diphthong *ai* *i* shews itself often in the Gothic and in certain places in a regular manner as *i* (§ 2\*) and in the same places the *a* contained in *ai* (*a + i*) becomes *i* which with the second element of the diphthong generates a long *i* (written as *ei* § 70). The Gothic *iu* has either retained that form in Old High German or has altered sometimes one sometimes both of its constituents. Thus have arisen *io eo* [C I d p 71]. There is a greater distance to be passed in Otfried's theory of the substitution of *ia* for *iu* which cannot fail to surprise as we know that a simple *u* never becomes *a* + *i*. In Middle High German *iu* has either remained unaltered, or has been changed to *ie* which is as old as the latest Old High German as it is found in Nother. In Modern High German the substitution of *ie* for the old *iu* is that which principally

\* *Ahtau* = *eight* *iu* is perhaps the only case in which the Gothic *au* corresponds to the Sanskrit *अष्टौ* diphthong *ai* *au*, on the other hand *au* often answers to *औ* = (*a + u*)

† There is yet another *ia* in Old High German namely that which Grimm (p 103) very acutely represents as the result of a contraction and formerly dissyllabic to which, therefore there is no counterpart diphthong in Gothic. The most important case will I discuss under the head of the verb, in preterites such as *hialf* I held Gothic *haihal*. After this analogy *fiar* 'four' (according to Otfried), arose out of the Gothic *fi hior* in this way that after the extrusion of the *di* the *e* passed into its corresponding short vowel — Grimm p 103

pally prevails, in which, however, the *e* is only visibly retained, for phonetically it is absorbed by the *i*. Compare *ich biēte* with the Gothic *biuda*, *griesse* with *griuta*. Besides this form, we also find *eu* in place of the old *iu* or still older *au*, in cases, namely, where *e* can be accounted for as the result of a no longer perceptible modification (Grimm, p. 523, § 75), compare *Leute* with the Gothic *laudans*, Old High German *luti*, "people", *Hieu*, "hay," with Goth, *havi*, "grass" Usually, however, the Gothic has already acquired an *iu* in place of this *eu*, and the original *au* (which becomes *av* before vowels) is to be sought in the Sanskrit, for instance, *Neune*, "nine," Old High German *niunz*, Gothic *niners*, Sanskrit नवन् *navan* (as theme), *neu*, "new," Old High German *nwi* (indeclinable), Gothic *nwi-s*, Sanskrit नवस् *navas* This *e*, however, is difficult to account for, in as far as it is connected with the *Umlaut*, because it corresponds to an *i* in Middle and Old High German, and this vowel, of itself answering to an *i* or *y* in the following syllable, is capable of no alteration through the power of attraction Long *u* for *iu*, equivalent to a transposition of the diphthong, is found in *lugen*, "to lie," *trugen*, "to deceive," Middle High German *lugen*, *truugen*

[G Ed p 72] 84 Where the *a* element of the Sanskrit ओ *ō* retains its existence in the Gothic, making *au* the equivalent of *ō*, the Middle High German, and a part of the Old High German authorities, have *ou* in the place of *au*, although, as has been remarked in § 80, under the influence of certain consonants *ō* prevails Compare Old High German *pouc*, Middle High German *bouc*, with the Gothic preterite *baug*, "*flexi*" The *o* of the High German *ou* has the same relation to the corresponding Gothic *a* in *au*, as the Greek *o* in βούς bears to the Sanskrit अ *a*, which undergoes a fusion with उ *u* in the ओ *ō* of the cognate word गो *gō* The oldest Old High German authorities (Gl Hiab Ker Is) have *au* for the *ou* of the later (Grimm p 99), and as.

under the conditions specified in § 80, they also exhibit *o* thus tells in favour of Grimm's assumption, that *au* in the Gothic and oldest High German was pronounced like our German *au* and thus not like the Sanskrit *औ* *o* (out of *a + u*). In this case in the Gothic *ai* also, both the letters must have been sounded, and this diphthong must be only an etymological and not a phonetic equivalent of the Sanskrit *ऐ*.

85 In the Gothic diphthong *ai* the *n* alone is susceptible of alteration, and appears in High German softened down to *e* in the cases in which the *ē* contracted from *ai* (§ 78), does not occur. In Modern High German, however *ei* in pronunciation = *ai*. Compare

GOthic	OLD HIGH GERMAN	MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN	MODERN HIGH GERMAN
<i>haila loco</i> "	<i>hei u</i>	<i>heize</i>	<i>heisse</i>
<i>skauda separo</i> ,	<i>skeidu</i>	<i>scheide</i>	<i>scheide</i>

86 (1) Let us now consider the consonants preserving the Indian arrangement and thus examining [G Ed p 73] the gutturals first. Of these, the Gothic has merely the *tenuis* and the medial (*k g*) and Ulfilas in imitation of the Greek places the latter as a nasal before gutturals for instance *driglan*, 'to drink' *briggjan* to bring *tuggō* tongue *yuggs* "young", *gnggs* n going (subst). For the compound *lv* the old writing has a special character, which we like Grimm render by *qt* although *q* does not appear elsewhere and *v* also combines with *g* so that *qt* (= *lv*) plainly bears the same relation to *gv* that *k* bears to *g* compare *siggjan* to sink with *siggjan* to read to sing. It also in Gothic, willingly combines with *v*, and for this combination also the original text has a special character compare *saihtau lehtau* with our *sehen leihen*. In respect to *h* by itself we have to observe that it often appears in relations in which the dentals place their *th* and the labials their *f*, so that in this case it takes the place of

*kh*, which is wanting in the Gothic. In this manner is *akh* related to *argum*, "we have," as *bauth* to *budum*, and *gaf* to *gêbum*. Probably the pronunciation of the Gothic *h* was not in all positions the same, but in terminations, and before *t* and *s*, if not generally before consonants, corresponded to our *ch*. The High German has *ch* as an aspirate of the *h* for this *tenuis*, however, either *h* or *c* stands in the older dialects, the use of which, in Middle High German, is so distinguished, that *c* stands as a terminating letter, and in the middle of words before *t*, and *ch* also stands for a double *h* (Grimm, p. 422.) This distinction reminds us of the use of the Zend  $\text{𐬵}$  *c* in contrast to  $\text{𐬫}$  *k*, as also of the  $\text{𐬭}$  *t* in contrast to  $\text{𐬮}$  *t* (§§ 34 38)

(2) The palatals and linguals are wanting in Gothic, as in Greek and Latin, the dentals are, in Gothic, *t*, *th*, *d*, [G Ed p 74] together with their nasal *n*. For *th* the Gothic alphabet has a special character. In the High German *z* (= *ts*) fills the place of the aspiration of the *t*, so that the breathing is replaced by the sibilation. By the side of this *z* in the Old High German, the old Gothic *th* also maintains its existence. There are two species of *z*, which, in Middle High German, do not agree with each other. In the one, *t* has the preponderance, in the other, *s*, and this latter is written by Isidor *zs*, and its reduplication *zss*, while the reduplication of the former he writes *tz*. In the Modern High German the second species has only retained the sibilant, but in writing is distinguished, though not universally, from *s* proper. Etymologically, both species of the Old and Middle High German *z* fall under the same head, and correspond to the Gothic *t*.

(3) The labials are, in Gothic, *p*, *f*, *b*, with their nasal

\* Our Modern High German *th* is, according to Grimm (p. 525), inorganic, and to be rejected. "It is, neither in pronunciation nor origin, properly aspirated, and nothing but a mere *tenuis*."

*m* The High German supplies this organ, as the Sanskrit does all with a double aspiration *n* surd ( $f = \text{ṇ} ph$ ) (see § 25) and a sonant which is written *ṇ* and comes nearer to the Sanskrit  $\text{ṇ} bh$ . In Modern High German we perceive no longer any phonetic difference between *f* and *v* but in Middle High German *ṇ* shews itself in this manner softer than *f*, in that, first at the end of words it is transformed into *f*, on the same principle by which, in such a position the medials are converted into tenuis for instance, *wolf* not *wolh*, but genitive *wolfes* second that in the middle before surd consonants it becomes *f* hence *ziche* becomes *zicfste* *funt* becomes *funfte* *funtze*. At the beginning of words *f* and *ṇ* in Middle High German seem of equal signification and their use in the MSS is precarious, [C Ed p 75] but *ṇ* preponderates (Grimm, pp 379 100). It is the same in Old High German yet Notker uses *f* as the original primarily existing breathing sound and *ṇ* as the softer or sonant aspiration, and therefore employs the latter in cases where the preceding word concludes with one of those letters which otherwise (§ 23) soften down a tenuis to its medial (Grimm pp 17, 136) for instance, *demo ṇter den waler* but not *des waler* but *des faler*. So far the rule is less stringent (observes Grimm) that in all cases *f* may stand for *ṇ* but the converse does not hold. Many Old High German authorities abandon altogether the imitatory *ṇ* and write *f* for it constantly namely Kero, Otfrid, Tatian. The aspiration of the *p* is sometimes in Old High German also rendered by *ph*, but in general only at the beginning of words of foreign origin, *phorta phennig* in the middle and at the end occasionally, in true Germanic forms such as *werphan* *werph*, *wurphumēs* in Tatian, *limphan* in Otfrid and Tatian. According to Grimm, *ph* in many cases, has had the mere sound of *f*. In monumental inscriptions however which usually employ *f* the *ph* of many words had indisputably the sound of *pf* for example if Otfrid



writes *kuphar*, "*cuprum*," *scepheri*, "Creator," we are not to assume that these words were pronounced *kufar*, *sceferi*" (p. 132) In Middle High German the initial *ph* of foreign

words of the Old High German has become *pf* (Grimm, p. 326) In the middle and at the end we find *pf*, first, always

after *m*, *kampf*, "*pugna*," *lampf*, "*vapor*," *kriempfen*, "*contractare*," in which case *p* is an euphonic appendage to *f*, in order to facilitate a union with *m*. Secondly, in compounds with the inseparable prefix *ent*, which, before the labial aspirates, lays aside its *t*, or, as seems to me the sounder supposition, converts that letter, by assimilation, into the labial tenuis Hence, for

[G Ed p 76] instance, *enp-finden*, later and more harmonious *emp-finden*, for *ent-finden* Standing alone, nevertheless, it appears, in Middle High German, *vinden*, but *v* does not combine with *p*, for after the surd *p* (§ 25.) the surd aspirate is necessary (see Grimm, p. 398). Thirdly, after short vowels the labial aspirates are apt to be preceded by their tenues; as

well in the middle as at the end of words just as in Sanskrit (Gramm. Crit. r. 88) the palatal surd aspirate between a short and another vowel or semi-vowel is preceded by its tenuis, and, for instance, पृच्छति *pṛichchhati* is said for पृच्छति *pṛichhati*

"interrogat," from the root पृच्छ *pṛichh* In this light I view the Middle High German forms *kopf*, *kropf*, *tropfe*, *klopfen*, *kripfen*, *kapfen* (Grimm, p. 398) In the same words we sometimes find *ff*, as *kaffen*, *schuffen* Here, also, *p* has

assimilated itself to the following *f*; for *f*, even though it be the aspirate of *p*, is not pronounced like the Sanskrit पृ *ph*, that is, like *p* with a clearly perceptible *h*, but the sounds *p* and *h* are compounded into a third simple sound lying between the two, which is therefore capable of reduplication, as in Greek φ unites itself with θ, while *ph* + *th* would be impossible

(4) The Sanskrit semi-vowels are represented in Gothic by *j* (= *y*), *r*, *l*, *v*, the same in High German, only in Old High German Manuscripts the sound of the Indo-Gothic *v*

(our *w*) is most usually represented by *uu* in Middle High German by *vv* *j* (or *y*) in both is written *i*. We agree with Grimm in using *j* (or *y*) and *w* for all periods of the High German. After an initial consonant in Old High German the semi vowel *w* in most authorities is expressed by *u* for instance *zuelif* twelve Gothic *twalif*. As in the Sanskrit and Zend the semi vowels *y* and *v* often arise out of the corresponding vowels *i* and *u* so also in the [G Ed p 77] Germanic for instance Gothic *sunu* *ē*, 'filiorum' from the base *sunu*, with *u* affected by Guna (*iu* § 27). More usually, however in the Germanic the converse occurs namely, that *y* and *i* in terminations and before consonants have become vocalised (see § 73) and have only retained their original form before terminations beginning with a vowel for if for instance *thus* servant forms *thuis* in the genitive we know from the history of the word that *thuis* has not sprung from the *u* of the nominative, but that *thuis* is a mutilation of *thuias* (§ 116) so that after the lapso of the *a* the preceding semi vowel has become a whole one. In like manner is *thui* maid servant a mutilation of the base *thuiyō* (§ 120) whose nominative like the accusative probably was *thuiya* for which however, in the accusative after the *v* had become vocalized *thuiya* was substituted.

(c) Of the Sanskrit sibilants the Germanic has only the last namely the pure dental *ṣ* *s*. Out of this however springs another, peculiar at least in use to the Gothic which is written *~* and had probably a softer pronunciation than *s*. This *z* is most usually found between two vowels as an euphonic alteration of *s* but sometimes also between a vowel and *v* *l*, or *n* and between liquids (*l* *r* *n*) and a vowel *y* or *n* in some words also before *d* finally before the guttural medial in the single instance *a gō* ashes everywhere thus before sonants and it must therefore itself be considered as a sonant sibilant (§ 20) while

s is the surd. It is remarkable, in a grammatical point of view, that a concluding s before the enclitic particles *et* and *wh*, and before the passive addition *a*, passes into z, hence, for instance, *thizei* "cujus," from *this* "hujus," *thanzei* "quos," from *thans* "hos," *vileizuh* "visne" from *vileis* "vis," *hailaza* "vocaris," from *hailis* "locas," or rather from its earlier form

[G Ed p 78.] *hailas*. The root *slēp*, "to sleep," forms, by a reduplication, in the preterite, *saizlēp*, "I or he slept." Other examples are, *izwis*, "vobis," "vos," *razn* "house," *tal yan*, "to teach," *marzyan*, "to provoke," *fairzna*, "heel." The High German loves the softening of s into r, especially between two vowels (see § 22.), but this change has not established itself as a pervading law, and does not extend over all parts of the Grammar. For instance, in Old High German, the final s of several roots has changed itself into r before the preterite terminations which commence with a vowel, on the other hand, it has remained unaltered in the uninflected first and third pers sing. indicative, and also before the vowels of the present. For example, from the root *lus*, comes *lusu*, "I lose," *lōs*, "I or he lost," *lurum's* "we lost." While in these cases the termination takes s under its protection, yet the s of the nominative singular, where it has not been altogether dropped, is everywhere softened down to r, and, on the other hand, the concluding s of the genitive has, down to our time, remained unaltered, and thus an organic difference has arisen between two cases originally distinguished by a similar suffix. For instance,

GOTHIC		OLD HIGH GERMAN	MODERN HIGH GERMAN
Nominative .	<i>blind'-s</i> ,	<i>plintē-i</i> ,	<i>blinde-r</i>
Genitive .	<i>blindz-s</i> ,	<i>plinte-s</i> ,	<i>blinde-s</i>

87 The Germanic tongues exhibit, in respect of consonants, a remarkable law of displacement, which has been first recognised and developed with great ability by Grimm. According to this law, the Gothic, and the other dialects,

with the exception of the High German, in relation to the Greek Latin, and, with certain limits also [C Ed p 79] to the Sanskrit and Zend substitute aspirates for the original tenuis *h* for *k* *th* for *t* and *f* for *p* tenuis for medials *t* for *d* *p* for *b* and *k* for *g* finally medials for aspirates *g* for *χ* *d* for *θ* and *b* for *φ* The High German bears the same regular relation to the Gothic as the latter to the Greek and substitutes its aspirates for the Gothic tenuis and Greek medials its tenuis for the Gothic medials and Greek aspirates and its medials for the Gothic aspirates and Greek tenuis Yet the Gothic labial and guttural medial exhibits itself unaltered in most of the Old High German authorities as in the Middle and Modern High German for instance Gothic *biuga* *stecla*, Old High German *biuga* and *pink* ; Middle High German *biuge* Modern High German *biege* For the Gothic *f* the Old High German substitutes *i* especially as a first letter (§ 86 2) In the *t* sounds *z* in High German (= *ts*) replaces an aspirate The Gothic has no aspiration of the *k* and either replaces the Greek *κ* by the simple aspiration *h* in which case it sometimes coincides with the Sanskrit *ḥ* or it falls to the level of the High German and in the middle or end of words, usually gives *g* instead of *k* the High German adhering, as regards the beginning of words to the Gothic practice and participating with that dialect in the use of the *h* We give here Grimm's table illustrating the law of these substitutions p 541

Greek	<i>P</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Th</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>Ch</i>
Gothic	<i>I</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Th</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>D</i>		<i>K</i>	<i>G</i>
Old High German	<i>B(I)</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>Ch</i>	<i>K</i>

[G Ed p 80]

## EXAMPLES \*

SANSKRIT	GRIK	LATIN	GOthic	OLD HIGH GERMAN
पादस् <i>pāda-s</i> ,	πούς, ποδ-ός,	<i>pes, pedis</i> ,	<i>folus</i> ,	<i>ruoz</i>
पञ्चन् <i>panchan</i> ,	πέμπς,	<i>quinque</i> ,	<i>finf</i> ,	<i>unf</i>
पूर्ण <i>pūrṇa</i> ,	πλός,	<i>plenus</i> ,	<i>fulls</i> ,	<i>uol</i>
पितृ <i>pitṛ</i> ,	πατήρ,	<i>pater</i> ,	<i>fadrem</i> †,	<i>zaton</i>
उपरि <i>upari</i> ,	ὑπέρ,	<i>super</i> ,	<i>usar</i> ,	<i>ubar</i>
	κάναβις,	<i>cannabis</i> ,	. .	<i>hanaf</i> .
भञ्ज <i>bhanj</i> ,		<i>frangere</i> ,	<i>brikan</i> ,	<i>prichan</i> .
भुज् <i>bhuj</i> ,		<i>fiu, fructus</i> ,	<i>brūkōn</i> ,	<i>prūchōn</i> .
भ्रातृ <i>bhrātṛ</i>		<i>frater</i> ,	<i>biōthar</i> ,	<i>piuoder</i> .
भृ <i>bhṛ</i> ,	φέρω,	<i>fero</i> ,	<i>baira</i> ,	<i>piru</i>
भ्रू <i>bhrū</i> ,	ὀφρύς,			<i>prauva</i>
कपाल <i>kapāla, m n</i> ,	κεφαλή,	<i>caput</i> ,	<i>haubith</i> ,	<i>houpit</i> .
त्वम् <i>twam</i> (nom.),	τύ,		<i>thu</i> ,	<i>du</i> .
तम् <i>tam</i> (acc),	τόν,	<i>is-tum</i> ,	<i>thana</i> ,	<i>den</i>
त्रयस् <i>triśyas</i> (n pl),	τρῖς,	<i>tres</i> ,	<i>threis</i> ,	<i>drī</i> .
अन्तर <i>antara</i> ,	ἄντρος,	<i>alter</i> ,	<i>anhar</i> ,	<i>andar</i>
दन्तम् <i>danta-m</i> (acc),	ὀδόντ-α,	<i>dentem</i> ,	<i>thuntu-s</i> ,	<i>zand</i> .
द्वौ <i>dwau</i> (n du),	δύο,	<i>duo</i> ,	<i>ti ai</i> ,	<i>zueñe</i>
दक्षिण <i>dakṣiṇā</i> ,	δεξιά,	<i>dextra</i> ,	<i>taihsvō</i> ,	<i>zēsnuu</i>
उद <i>uda</i> ,	ὕδωρ,	<i>unda</i> ,	<i>zātō</i> ,	<i>uazar</i> .
दुहितृ <i>duhitṛ</i> ,	θυγάτηρ,	.	<i>dauhtar</i> ,	<i>tolhtar</i> .
द्वौ <i>dwau</i> ,	δύο,	<i>fores</i> ,	<i>daur</i> ,	<i>tor</i> .
मधु <i>madhu</i> ,	μέθυ,	. .	.	<i>meto</i>
श्वन् <i>śwan</i> ,	κύων,	<i>canis</i> ,	<i>hunths</i> ,	<i>hund</i> .
हृदय <i>hṛdaya</i> ,	καρδία,	<i>cor</i> ,	<i>harrtō</i> ,	<i>herza</i>
अक्ष <i>akṣha</i> ,	ὀκος,	<i>oculus</i> ,	<i>augō</i> ,	<i>ouga</i>
अश्रु <i>asṛu</i> ,	δάκρυ,	<i>lacrima</i> ,	<i>tagr m.</i> ,	<i>zahan</i>
पशु <i>paśu</i> ,		<i>pecus</i> ,	<i>faihu</i> ,	<i>vihu</i>

\* The Sanskrit words here stand, where the termination is not separated from the base, or the case not indicated, in their crude or simple form (theme), of the verb, we give only the bare root

† "Parents"

AN FRIT	GREEK	LATIN	GOthic	OLD HIGH GER I
शसुर <i>śaśura</i>	εκυρος,	<i>socer</i>	<i>siathra</i>	<i>suehur</i>
दशन् <i>dasan</i>	δεκα,	<i>decem</i>	<i>lathun</i>	<i>zēhan</i>
ज्ञान <i>jñā</i>	γινωμι,	<i>gnoisco</i>	<i>kan</i>	<i>chan</i>
जाति <i>jāt</i> *	γενος,	<i>genus</i>	<i>kunī</i>	<i>chunī</i>
जानु <i>jānu</i>	γονυ	<i>genu</i>	<i>knū</i>	<i>chunū</i>
महत् <i>mahat</i>	μεγαλος	<i>magnus,</i>	<i>mihils</i>	<i>mihil</i>
हंस <i>hansa</i>	χην	<i>anser</i>	<i>gans</i>	<i>kans</i>
ह्यस् <i>hyas</i>	χθες	<i>heri</i>	<i>gistra</i>	<i>kistar</i>
लिह <i>lih</i>	λεγω	<i>lingo</i>	<i>laigō,</i>	<i>lêkôm</i>

88 The Lithuanian has left the consonants without displacement in their old situations, only, from its deficiency in aspirates, substituting simple tenues for the Sanskrit aspirated tenues and medials for the aspirated medials. Compare,

LITHUANIAN	SANSKRIT
<i>rata s</i> 'wheel	रथस <i>rat̥ha s</i> <i>vaḡgou</i>
<i>būsu</i> I would be,	भविष्यामि <i>bhaviṣhyāmi</i>
<i>ka s</i> who	कम् <i>ka s</i>
<i>dumī</i> I give	ददामि <i>dadāmi</i> [G Ed p 2.]
<i>pats</i> 'husband <i>inastai</i>	पतिस् <i>pati s</i>
<i>penki</i> five	पञ्चन् <i>panchan</i>
<i>trys</i> three	त्रयस् <i>trayas</i> (n pl m)
<i>keturt</i> four "	चतुर्विन् <i>chaturvīras</i> (n pl m)
<i>keturtas</i> the fourth	चतुर्थस् <i>chaturtha s</i>
<i>sala f</i> bough,	सकृद् <i>sākhā</i>

Irregular deviations occur, as might be expected, in individual cases. Thus, for instance, *naga s* "nail" (of the foot or finger) not *naka s* answers to the Sanskrit नखस् *nakhas*. The Zend stands as we have before remarked, in the same rank in all essential respects, as the Sanskrit

\* From *jim* 'to be born'



## GOTHIC

## ZENI

thū	thou	𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌴	thum
fid or (ind)	four	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	chathu drō (u pl m)
fimf		𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	pancha
fulls	full	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	perenō (u m)
fadreim	parents	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	paitar em (patrem)
faths	master "	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	paili s
fathu	beast	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	pasu s
faryith	he wanders	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	charaiti
fith s	foot	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	pīdha (§ 39)
frathuth	he asks "	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	per waili
ufar	over	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	upairi (§ 11)
af	from "	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	apa
thai	these	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	te
htas	who	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	lu [C I d p 81]
htai	two	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	dra
taihun	ten	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	dava
taihso	right hand	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	dashuna dexter

In the Sanskrit and Zend the sourant aspirates not the surd as in Greek (𐌸 h too is sourant see § 20) correspond according to rule to the Gothic medials as however in the Zend the bh is not found 𐌿 b answers to the Gothic b Compare

## GOTHIC

## ZENI

## SANSKRIT

urith	he carries	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	baraiti	बिभर्ति bibharti
rōthar	brother	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	brdtarem (nec)	भ्रातृ bhrātaram (nec)
ai	both	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	uba	उभौ ubhāu (u ac 1 du)
rukan	to use			भुज bhuj to eat
e (prep)		𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	abn 𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	अभि abhi
udya	muddling	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	maidhya	मय madhya
indan	bind	𐌿𐌺𐌰𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌴	bandh	बन्ध bandh

89 Violations of the law of displacement of sounds both by persistence in the same original sound or the substitution of irregular sounds are frequent in the middle and at the end of



words Thus, in the Old High German *vatar*, the *t* of the Greek *πατήρ* remains, in the Gothic *fadri ein*, “*parentes*,” *d* is substituted regularly for *th* The same phenomenon occurs in the cases of the Old High German *olpenta*, and the Gothic *ulbandus*, contrasted with the *τ* of *ἐλcφαντ-*, thus, also, the *t* of चतुर् *chatur*, “*quatuor*,” has become *d* in the Gothic *fidvōi* instead of *th*, but in High German has entirely disappeared The *p* of the Sanskrit root स्वप् *swap*, (Latin *sopio*,) “*sleep*,” has been preserved in the Gothic *slēpa*, and [G. Ed p 85] the Old High German *slāfu* stands in the Gothic category, but the Sanskrit root is more faithfully preserved in the Old High German in *in-suepyu* (*sopio*, see § 86 4.)

90 Nor have the inflexions or grammatical appendages everywhere submitted to the law of displacement, but have, in many instances, either remained faithful to the primary sound, or have, at least, rejected the particular change prescribed by § 87. Thus the Old High German has, in the third person, as well singular as plural, retained the original *t*, compare *hapēt*, “*he has*,” *hapēnt*, “*they have*,” with *habet*, *habent* the Gothic, on the contrary, says *habaith*, *haband*, the first in accordance with the law, the last in violation of it, for *habanth* Thus, also, in the part pres, the *t* of the old languages has become, under the influence of the preceding *n*, not *th* but *d*, the *t* of the part. pass., however, is changed before the *s* of the nom into *th*, but before vowel termina-

---

It would be better to regard the phenomenon here discussed by assuming *d* as the proper character of the third person in Gothic, and viewing the Old High German *t* as the regular substitute for it The *d* has been retained in the Gothic passive also (*bair-a-da*), and the active form *bairith* is derivable from *bairid*, in that the Gothic prefers the aspirates to the medials at the end of a word The same is the case with the part pass, the suffix of which is, in Gothic, *da*, whence, in Old High German, in consequence of the second law for the permutation of sounds, comes *ta*, so that the old form recurs again, re-introduced by a fresh corruption

tions by an anomalous process into *d* after the same principle by which the *th* of the third person before the vowel increment of the passive is softened to *d* so that *da\** instead of *tha* corresponds to the Greek *το* of *ετρεττο* *ο* and to the Sanskrit *ता* of *अभारता* *abharata* The Old High German on the other hand has preserved the original *t* in both participles *hap'inter hap'eter* Gothic *habands* genitive *habandins* *habaiths* gen *habaidis*

91 Special notice is due to the fact, that in the middle of words under the protection of a preceding consonant the old consonant often remains without displacement sometimes because it chimes in well with the preceding sound sometimes because through regard for the preceding letters, alterations have been admitted other than those which the usual practice as to displacement would lead us to expect Mute consonants (§ 25) among which in [G Ed p 86] the Germanic the *h* must be reckoned, where it is to be pronounced like our *ch*, protect a succeeding original *l* Thus अष्टि *aṣṭi* 'eight' οκτω *okto* 'octo' is in Gothic *altau* in Old High German *altō* नक्तम *nakṭam* (adverbial accusative) 'night' νύξ *nyx*, 'noctis' is in Gothic *nahts* Old High German *naht* The liquids, on the other hand, like the vowels, which they approach nearest of all consonants, affect a *d* or *th* after themselves From these euphonic causes for instance the feminine suffix *ti* in Sanskrit in Greek *σις* as ποιησις, which designates abstract substantives, appears in Gothic in three forms, *ti*, *di* and *thi* The original form *ti* shews itself after *f*, into which *p* and *b* mostly resolve themselves and also after *s* and *h* for instance *aust(i)s* (§ 117) 'grace' from the root *an* Old High German *uanan*, 'to be gracious' with the insertion of an euphonic *s* *fralust(i)s* 'loss' (from *luz* pres *lusa*) *mahl(i)s* 'strength' (from *magan*) *fra gisl(i)s* 'betrothment,' (from *gib*, *gaf*) also *fragibts*, perhaps erroneously, as *h* has little

\* *Da* is an abbreviation of *daa* = *Ura*. Smiles 1968: § 400.

affinity with *t* *ga-skaf*(*i*)s, "creation," (from *skap-an*). The form *di* finds its place after vowels, but is able, where the vowel of the suffix falls away, *i. e.* in the nom. and accus. sing., to convert *d* into *th*, because *th* can, more easily than *d*, dispense with a following vowel, and is a favourite letter at the end of words and before consonants, though *d* also is tolerated in such a position. Hence the root *bud*, "to bid," (pres *bruda*, § 27.) forms, in the uninflected condition of the pret., *bauth*, in the plur. *bud-um*, and the nominal base, *mana-sê-di*, "world," (according to Grimm's well-founded interpretation, "seed, not seat, of man,") forms in the nom. and accus. *mana-sêths*, *mana-sêth*, or *mana-sêds*, *mana-sêd*, but in the dat. *mana-sêdar* not *-sêthar*. On the other hand, after liquids the suffix is usually *thi*, and after *n*, *di* the dental, however, once chosen, remains afterwards in every position, either without a vowel or before vowels, for instance, *gabaurths*, "birth," dat. *gabaurthar*, *gafaurds*, "gathering"

[G Ed p 87] (from *far-yan*, "to go"), gen. *gafaurdais* *gakunths*, "esteem," gen. *gakunthais*, *gamunds*, "memory," gen. *gamundais*, *gaqvumths*, "meeting," dat. *gaqvumthar*, dat. plur. *gaqvumthum*. From the union with *m*, *d* is excluded. On the whole, however, the law here discussed accords remarkably with a similar phenomenon in modern Persian, where the original *t* of grammatical terminations and suffixes is maintained only after mute consonants, but after vowels and liquids is changed into *d* hence, for instance, *qirif-tan*, "to take," *bas-tan*, "to bind," *dâsh-tan*, "to have," *pukh-tan*, "to cook" on the other hand, *dâ-dan*, "to give," *bur-dan*, "to bear," *âm-dan*, "to come" I do not, therefore, hesitate to release the Germanic suffix *ti*, and all other suffixes originally commencing with *t*, from the general law of substitution of sounds, and to assign the lot of this *t* entirely to the controul of the preceding letter. The Old High German, in the case of our suffix *ti*, as in that of other suffixes and terminations originally commencing with *t*, accords to the original *t* a

far more extensive prevalence than does the Gothic *nas* much as it retains that letter, not only when protected by *s*, *h*, and *f*, but also after vowels and liquids—after *m* an euphonic *f* is inserted—and the *t* is only after *l* changed into *d*. Hence for instance, *ans t*, ‘grace’ *hlouft*, ‘course’ *mah t* ‘might’, *sa t*, ‘seed’ *kipurt* ‘birth’ *iar t*, ‘journey’, *mua t* ‘protection’ *li uat t* ‘force’, *scult* *schuld* ‘guilt’ *chumft*, ‘arrival’.

92 The law of substitution shows the greatest pertinacity at the beginning of words, and I have found it everywhere observed in the relation of the Gothic to the Greek and Latin. On the other hand, in some roots which are either deficient or disfigured in the Old European languages but which are common to the Germanic and the Sanskrit the Gothic stands on the same footing with [G. Ed. p. 88] the Sanskrit especially in respect of initial medials. Thus, *बन्ध bandh* ‘to bind’ is also *band* in Gothic not *paand* *ग्रह grah* in the Vedas *ग्रह grabh* ‘to take’ seize is *grip* (p. 105 *greipa* with Guna § 27) not *krip* \* to *ग gā* and *गम् gam*, ‘to go’ correspond *gagga* ‘I go’ and *ga tūð* ‘street’ *दह dah* ‘to burn’ is in Old High German *dah an* (ðaiw) ‘to burn’ ‘to light’. I can detect however no instance in which Gothic tenues correspond to Sanskrit as initial letters.

93() We return now to the Sanskrit in order with relation to the most essential laws of sound to notice one adverted to in our theory of single letters where it was said of several concurrent consonants that they were tolerated neither at the end of words nor in the middle before strong consonants and how their places were supplied in such situations. It is besides to be observed that properly tenues alone can terminate a Sanskrit word but medials only before sonants (§ 25) may either be retained, if they originally terminate in inflective base or take the place of a tenuis

\* The Latin *prehendo* is probably related to the Sanskrit root *ग्रह grah* through the usual interchange between gutturals and labials.

or an aspirate, if these happen to precede sonants in a sentence. As examples, we select हरिन् *harit*, (*viridis*), "green," वेदविद् *veda-vid*, "skilled in the Vêda," धनलब् *dhana-lab*, "acquiring wealth." These words are, according to § 91, without a nominative sign. We find, also, अस्ति हरिन् *astī harit*, "he is green," अस्ति वेदविन् *astī vedā-vit*, अस्ति धनलब् *astī dhana-lap*, on the other hand, हरिद् अस्ति *harid astī*, वेदविद् अस्ति *vedavid astī*, धनलब् अस्ति *dhana-lab astī*, also, हरिद् भवति *harid bhavati*, &c. With this Sanskrit law the Middle High

[G Ed p 89] German is very nearly in accordance, which indeed tolerates aspirates at the end of words, contrary to the custom of the Sanskrit, only with a conversion of the sonant *v* into the surd *f*, see § 86. 3, but, like the Sanskrit, and independent of the law of displacement explained in §. 87, supplies the place of medials at the end of words regularly by tenuis. As, for example, in the genitives *tages*, *eides*, *uîbes*, of which the nom. and accus. sing., deprived of the inflexion and the terminating vowel of the base, take the forms *tac*, (§ 86 1) *et*, *wîp*. So also as to the verb, for instance, the roots *trag*, *lad*, *grab*, form, in the uninflected 1st and 3d pers sing. pret, *truoc*, *luot*, *gruop*, plur. *truogen*, *luoden*, *gruoben*. Where, on the other hand, the tenuis or aspirate (*v* excepted) is radical, there no alteration of sound occurs in declension or in conjugation. For instance, *wort*, gen. *wortes*, not *wordes*, as in Sansk ददन् *dadat*, "the giver," gen ददन्स् *dadatas*, not ददद्स् *dadadas*, but विन् *vit*, "knowing," gen विद्स् *vidas*, from the base विद् *vid*. In Old High German different authorities of the language are at variance with respect to the strict observance of this law. Isidor is in accordance with it, insomuch that he converts *d* at the end into *t*, and *g* into *c*, for instance, *wort*, *wordes*, *dac*, *dages*. The Gothic excludes only the labial medials from terminations, but replaces them, not by tenuis, but by aspirates. Hence *gaf*, "I gave," in contrast to *gêbum*, and the accusatives *hlayf*, *lauf*, *thuuf*, opposed to the nominatives *hlarbs*, *laubs*, *thuubs*, gen *hlarbis*, &c. The guttural and dental

medials (*g d*) are tolerated by the Gothic in terminations yet even in these in individual cases a preference appears for the terminating aspirates Compare *bauth* 'I or he offered' with *budum* 'we offered' from the root *bud* *hailad a nominatur* with *hailith* (§ 67) '*nominat, aih* I have he has' with *aigum* 'we have'

[G Ed p 90] 93<sup>(b)</sup> In a sense also opposed to that of the above mentioned Sanskrit law we find in Old High German yet only in Nether an euphonic relation between terminating and initial letters of two words which come together (Grimm pp 130 138 181) As in Sanskrit the tenuis appears as an essential consonant fit for the conclusion of a sentence but exchangeable under the influence of a word following in a sentence for the medials, so with Nether the tenuis ranks as a true initial stands therefore at the beginning of a sentence and after strong consonants but after vowels and the weakest consonants the liquid is turned into a medial Thus for instance *ih pin* 'I am' but *ih ne bin* *ter dag*, 'the day' but *tes tages* *mit Iote* 'with God' but *minan got* 'my God'

91 Two consonants are no longer in the existing condition of the Sanskrit tolerated at the end of a word but the latter of the two is rejected This emasculation which must date from an epoch subsequent to the division of the language as this law is not recognised either by the Zend or by any of the European branches of the family has had in many respects a disadvantageous operation on the Grammar and has mutilated many forms of antiquity required by theory In the High German we may view as in some degree connected with this phenomenon the circumstance that roots with double liquids—*ll mm nn rr*—in forms which are indeclinable (and before the consonants of inflexions) reject the latter of the pair In the case also of terminations in double *h* or *t* one is rejected Hence for instance from *stihlu* (*pungo*) *ar prittu* (*stringo*) the 1st and 3d pers pret *stah* *ar prat* In Middle High German

in declensions in *ck*, *ff*, the last is rejected; for instance, *boc*, gen. *bockes*, *grif*, *griffes*. *tz* loses the *t*, for instance, *schaz*, *schalzes*

95 Between a final न् *n* and a succeeding *t* sound as which the palatals also must be reckoned, for च् *ch* is equivalent to *tsh* in the Sanskrit an euphonic sibilant is interposed, from the operation of the following *t*, and न्, by this sibilant, is converted, § 9, into Anuswâia, for instance, अभवन् तत्र *abhavans tatra*, (*abhavans-tatra*), "they were there" With this coincides the circumstance, that, in High German, between a radical *n* and the *t* of an affix, an *s*, in certain cases, is inserted, for instance, from the root *ann*, "to favour," comes, in Old High German, *an-s-t*, "thou favourest," *on-s-ta* or *onda*, "I favoured," *an-s-t*, "favour"; from *prann* comes *prun-s-t*, "aidour", from *chan* is derived *chun-s-t*, "knowledge," our German KUNST, in which, as in BRUNST and GUNST, (from *gonnen*, probably formed from the *ann* before noticed, and the preposite *g(e)*.) the euphonic *s* has stood fast The Gothic exhibits this phenomenon nowhere, perhaps, but in *an-s-ts* and *allbrun-s-ts* 'holocaustum' In Old High German we find still an *s* inserted after *r*, in the root *tan*, hence, *tar-s-t*, "thou darest," *tor-s-ta*, I dared" (Cf. §. 616 2d Note.)

96 In Sanskrit the interposed euphonic *s* has extended itself further only among the prefixed prepositions, which generally enter into most intimate and facile connection with the following root In this manner the euphonic *s* steps in between the prepositions सम् *sam*, अव *ava*, परि *pari*, प्रति *prati*, and certain words which begin with क् *k*. With this the Latin *s* between *ab* or *ob* and *c*, *q*, and *p*, remarkably accords\*,

[G. Ed p 92] which *s*, *ab* retains even in an isolated position, when the above-mentioned letters follow To this we also refer the *cosmittere* of Festus, instead of *committere*

\* We scarcely think it necessary to defend ourselves for dividing, with Vossius, *ob-solesco*, rather than with Schneider (p 571) *obs-olesco*

(Schneider p 475) unless an original *smulto* for *multo* is involved in this compound. In the Greek, *ς* shows an inclination for connection with *τ θ* and *μ* and precedes these letters as an euphonic link especially after short vowels in cases which require no special mention. In compounds like *σakes παλδς* I reckon the *ς* in opposition to the common theory as belonging to the base of the first member (§ 128). We have yet to consider a case of the interpolation of an euphonic labial which is common to the Old Latin and Germanic and serves to facilitate the union of the labial nasal with a dental. The Latin places *p* between *m* and *ν* following *t* or *s* the Gothic and Old High German *f* between *m* and *t*. Thus *sumpsit prompsit dempsit sumptus promptus demptus* Gothic *andanum fls* acceptance Old High German *chum fl* arrival. In Greek we find also the interpolation of an euphonic *β* after *μ*, of a *δ* after *ι* of a *θ* after *σ* in order to facilitate the union of *μ ν* and *σ* with *ρ* and *λ* (*μσσημβρια μσμβλεται, αιδρος μασθλη*—see Buttmann p 80), while the Modern Persian places an euphonic *d* between the vowel of a prefixed preposition and that of the following word as *be d ā* to him.

97 The Greek affords few specimens of variability at the end of words excepting from peculiarities of dialect, as the substitution of *ρ* for *ς*. The alteration of the *ν* in the article in old inscriptions and in the prefixes *συν εν*, and *παλιν* seems analogous to the changes which, according to § 18 the terminating *म m* in Sanskrit undergoes in all cases with reference to the letter which follows. [G Ed p 93]. The concluding *ν* in Greek is also generally a derivative from *μ* and corresponds to this letter which the Greek never admits as a termination in analogous forms of the Sanskrit Zend, and Latin. *N* frequently springs from a final *ς* thus for instance *μεν* (Doric *μες*) and the dual *των* answer to the Sanskrit personal terminations *मस् mas* *यस् thas* *तस् tis*. I have found this explanation which I have given elsewhere of the origin of the *ι* from *ς*



subsequently confirmed by the Prâkrit, in which, in like manner, the concluding *s* of the instrumental termination plural भिस् *bhis* has passed into the dull *n* (Anuswâra, § 9), and हि. *him* is said for *bhis*. An operation, which has a prejudicial effect on many Greek terminations, and disturbs the relation to cognate languages, is the suppression of the *t* sound at the end of words, where, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin it plays an essential part. In respect of the vowels, it is also worthy of notice, that in Sanskrit, but not in Zend, at the meeting of vowel terminations and commencements, a hiatus is guarded against, either by the fusion of the two vowels, or, in cases where the vowel has a cognate semi-vowel at its command, by its transition into this latter, provided the vowel following be unlike. We find, for instance, अस्तीदम् *astīdam*, “*est hoc*,” and अस्त्य अयम् *asty ayam*, “*est hic*” For the sake of clearness, and because the junction of two vowels might too often give the appearance of two or more words to one, I write in my most recent text अस्ती 'दम्, in order, by an apostrophe which I employ as a sign of fusion, to indicate that the vowel which appears wanting in the दम् *dam* is contained in the final vowel of the preceding word. We might, perhaps, still better write अस्ती~ 'दम्, in order directly [G Ed. p 94] at the close of the first word to shew that its final vowel has arisen out of a contraction, and that the following word participates in it.

98 We have now to consider the alterations in the middle of words, *i.e.* those of the final letters of the roots and nominal bases before grammatical endings, and we find, with respect to these, most life, strength, and consciousness in the Sanskrit, and this language is

\* We cannot guide ourselves here by the original MSS, as these exhibit no separation of words, and entire verses are written together without interruption, as though they were only a series of senseless syllables, and not words of independent place and meaning. As we must depart from Indian practice, the more complete the more rational the separation

placed on the highest point of antiquity inasmuch as the signification of every radical portion is still so strongly felt that while it admits of moderate changes for the avoiding of harshness it never if we except some vowel elisions permits the radical sense to be obliterated, or rendered irrecongnisable by concessions too great or transitions too daring. Yet does the Sanskrit, more than any of its kindred afford a field for the conflict of unsociable consonants a conflict however which is honourably and strenuously maintained. The Vowels and weak consonants (§ 25) of grammatical endings and suffixes exert no influence over preceding consonants, but strong consonants if surd (§ 25) require a tenuis and if sonant a medial before them. Thus *क्त्* and *चत्* allow only of *क्* not *ख्* *ग* *घ* preceding them only *क्त्* not *चत्* *द* *ध*, while on the other hand *चत्* allows only *ग* not *क्* *ख* *घ* only *द* not *क्त्* *चत्* *ध* only *ब* not *प* *फ* *भ* to precede it. The [G Ed p ७०] roots and the nominal bases have to regulate their final letters by this law and the occasion frequently presents itself since in comparison with the cognate languages, a far greater proportion of the roots connect the personal terminations immediately with the root and also among the case terminations there are many which begin with consonants (भ्याम् *bhyām* भिस् *bhis* भ्यस् *bhyas* सु *su*). To cite instances the root *अद्* *ad* to eat forms *अस्मि* *admi* I eat but not *अद्मि* *admi* (for *s* is surd) nor *अद्मि* *ad ti* *अद्थ* *ad tha* but *अस्मि* *at si* *अस्मि* *at ti* *अत्थ* *at tha* on the other hand in the imperative *अद्धि* *ad dhi* eat. The base *पद्* *pad* foot forms in the locative plural *पद्भ्यः* *pad bhis* not *पद्भ्यः* *pad bhis* on the other hand *महत्* *mahat* great forms in the instrumental plural *महद्भिः* *mahad bhis* not *महद्भिः* *mahat bhis*.

99 The Greek and Latin as they have come down to us have either altogether evaded this conflict of consonants or exhibit, in most cases with regard to the first of any two contiguous consonants a disposition to surrender it or

at least an indifference to its assistance towards the signification of the word, since they either abandon it altogether, or violently alter it, *i.e.* convey it beyond the limits of its proper organ. These two languages afford fewer occasions for harsh unions of consonants than the Sanskrit, principally because, with the exception of 'ΕΣ and 'ΙΔ in Greek, and *ES, FER, VEL, ED*, in Latin, as ἐσ-τί, ἐσ-μέν, ἐσ-τέ, ἴδ-μεν, ἴσ-τε, *est, estis, fer-t, fer-tis, vul-t, vul-tis*, no root, terminated by a consonant, joins on its personal terminations, or any of them, without the aid of a connecting vowel. The Greek perf. pass. makes an exception, and requires euphonic alterations, which, in part, come within the natural limits recognised by the Sanskrit, and, in part, overstep them.

[G Ed p 96] The gutturals and labials remain on the ancient footing, and before σ and τ observe the Sanskrit law of sound cited in §. 98, according to which κ-σ(ξ), κ-τ, π-σ, π-τ, are applied to roots ending in κ, γ, χ, or π, β, φ, because the surd σ or τ suffers neither medials nor aspirates before it, hence τέτριπ-σαι, τέτριπ-ται, from ΤΡΙΒ, τέτυκ-σαι, τέτυκ-ται, from ΤΥΧ. The Greek, however, diverges from the Sanskrit in this, that μ does not leave the consonant which precedes it unaltered, but assimilates labials to itself, and converts the guttural, tenuis and aspirate into medials. For τέτυμ-μαι, τέτριμ-μαι, πέπλεγ-μαι, τέτυγ-μαι, we should, on Sanskrit principles, write (§ 98) τέτυπ-μαι, τέτριβ-μαι, πεπλεκ-μαι, τετυχ-μαι. The *t* sounds carry concession too far, and abandon the Sanskrit, or original principle, as regards the gutturals, inasmuch as δ, θ, and ζ (δσ), instead of passing into τ before σ and τ, are extinguished before σ, and before τ and μ become σ (πέπεισ-ται, πέπει-σαι, πέπεισ-μαι, instead of πέπειτ-ται, πέπειτ-σαι, πεπειθ-μαι, or πεπειδ-μαι. The Greek declension affords occasion for the alteration of consonants only through the σ of the nominative and the dative plural termination in σι, and here the same principle holds good as in the case of the verb, and in the formation of words *kh* and *g* become, as in Sanskrit, *k* (ξ=κ-ς), and *b* and *ph* become *p*

The *t* sounds, on the other hand, contrary to the Sanskrit and in accordance with the enfeebled condition, in this respect, of the Greek, vanish entirely. We find *πov-ς* for *ποτ-ς*, *πov-σι* for *ποτ-σι*, which latter naturally and originally must have stood for *ποδ-σ* *ποδ-σι*.

100 In Latin the principal occasion for the alteration of consonants presents itself before the *s* of the perfect and the *t* of the supine, or other verbal substantive or adjective (participles) beginning with *t* and it is in [G Ed p 97] accordance with the Sanskrit law cited § 99 and the original condition of the language that the sonant guttural passes before *s* and *t* into *c* the sonant labial into *p* as in *rec-sit* (*rexi*) *rectum* from *reg-scripsi*, *scriptum* from *scrib*. It is also in accordance with the Sanskrit that *h* as a sonant (§ 25) and incompatible with a tenuis becomes *c* before *s* and *t* compare *rec-sit* (*rexi*) with the word of like signification *अवहृत्* *a vāh shrit*. If of the two final consonants of a root the last vanishes before the *s* of the perfect tense (*mulsi* from *mule* and *mulg-sparsi* from *sparg*) this accords with the Sanskrit law of sounds, by which of two terminating consonants of a nominal base the last vanishes before consonants of the case terminations. *D* ought to become *t* before *s*, and then the form so theoretically created *claut-sit* from *claud*, would accord with the Sanskrit forms such as *अतृत्* *a tāt sit* he tormented from *तृत्* *tud*. Instead however of this the *d* allows itself to be extinguished, so, however that in compensation a short vowel of the root is made long as *di-ti-si* or which is less frequent the *d* assimilates itself to the following *s*, as *cessi* from *ced*. With roots in *t* which are rarer assimilation usually takes place, as *con-cu-si* from *cui* on the other hand *mi-si* not *mis-si*, for *mit-si* from *mit* or *miti*. *B*, *m*, and *r* also afford instances of assimilation in *jus-si*, *pres-si* *ges-si* *us-si*\*. A third resource for the avoidance

Compared with the Sanskrit in which *उहृ* *uḥ* signifies I urn the sibilant must here pass for the original form.

of an union, very natural, but not endurable in this weakened state of the language, *ts*, is the suppression of the latter of these two letters, which is also compensated by the lengthening of a short radical vowel; thus,\* *sēdi* from [G. Ed. p. 98] *sčd*, *iždi* from *vīd* I believe, at least, that these forms are not derivable from *sedur*, *vidur*, and I class them with forms like *fōdi* from *fūd*, *lēgi*, for *lec-si*, from *lēg*, *fugi*, for *fuc-si*, from *fūg*. To these probably also belong *cāni*, *fāvi*, *fōvi*, for *pāvi*, *vōvi*, from *cāv*, &c. A *cavur*, &c. is hardly conceivable, *cavi* could never have had such an origin. I conjecture forms such as *cau-si*, *fau-si*, after the analogy of *cautum*, *fautum*, or *moc-si* (*mor*), after the analogy of *vic-si*, *con-nic-si*. (§. 19) Possibly a *moc-si* form might derive probability from the adverb *mor*, since the latter is probably derived from *mov*, as *cito* is from another root of motion. The *c* of *fluc-si*, *struc-si*, (*fluxi*, &c.) *fluxum*, *structum*, must, in the same manner, be considered as a hardening of *v*, and a *flu-vo*, *stru-vo*, be presupposed, with regard to which it is to be remembered, that, in Sanskrit also, *uv* often develops itself out of *उ u* before vowels (Gram. Crit. r. 50.<sup>b</sup>), on which principle, out of *flu*, *stru*, before vowels, we might obtain *fluv*, *struv*, and thence before consonants *fluc*, *struc*. Thus, also, *fructus* out of *fruv*-or for *fin*-or. In cases of *t* preceded by consonants, the suppression of *s* is the rule, and *ar-si* for *ard-i* an exception. *Prandi*, *frendi*, *pandi*, *verti*, &c., are in contrast to *ar-si* and other forms, like *mulsi* above mentioned, in their preserving the radical letter in preference to the auxiliary verb, and they accord in this with the Sanskrit rule of sound, by which the *s* of अतौत्सम् *atātut-sam*, अक्षौत्सम् *akṣhātut-sam*, &c., for the avoidance of hardness, is suppressed before strong consonants, and we find, for instance, अतौत्त *atātut-ta*, instead of अतौत्स *atātut-sta*. The perfects *sčidi*, *fīdi*, are rendered doubtful by their short vowel, and in their origin probably belong to the reduplicated preterites, their first syllable having

\* Cf. § 547, and for the whole § of §§ 547-576-579

perished in the lapse of time in other [C 14 p 79] respects *fidt scđi* correspond to *tuludı papūgi* not to speak of *teligi* the *i* of which latter is not original

101 The suffixes employed in the formation of words and beginning with *t* for the representation of which the supino may stand deserve special consideration in regard to the relations of sound generated by the conflict between *t* and the preceding consonant. According to the original law observed in the Sanskrit a radical *t* ought to remain unaltered before *tum* and *d* should pass into *t* as भेद्युम् *bhēdyum* "to cleave" from भिद् *bhid*. According to the degenerated practice of the Greek a radical *d* or *t* before *t* would become *s*. Of this second gradation we find a remnant in *comes tus comes tum* analogous to *est etis* &c. from *edo* we find however no *comes-tum comes tor* but in their place *comesum comesor*. We might question whether in *comesum* the *s* belonged to the root or to the suffix, whether the *d* of *ed* or the *t* of *tum* had been changed into *s*. The form *com estus* might argue the radicality of the *s*, but it is hard to suppose that the language should have jumped at once from *estus* to *esus* between which two an *essus* probably intervened analogous in *essum fissum quassum* &c. while the *t* of *tum, tur* &c. assimilated itself to the preceding *s*. Out of *essum* has arisen *esum* by the suppression of an *s* probably the first for where of a pair of consonants the one is removed it is generally the first (*ελμ* from *εσμ* πο-σι from ποδ-σι) possibly because as in § 100 an auxiliary verb is abandoned in preference to a letter of the main verb. After that the language had, through such forms as *ē-sum ca-sum diti sum fis-sum, quas-sum* habituated itself to an *s* in suffixes properly beginning with a *t*, *s* might easily insinuate itself into forms where it did not owe its origin to assimilation. Cs (r) is a [G 11 p 100] favourite combination hence *sic sum nec sum* &c. for *sic tum nec tum*. The liquids *m* excepted cannot special incli

nation for a succeeding *s*, most of all the *r*, hence, *ter-sum*, *mer-sum*, *cur-sum*, *par-sum*, *ver-sum*, in contrast to *par-tum*, *tor-tum* there are also cases in which *r*, by a conversion into *s*, accommodates itself to *t*, as in *ges-tum*, *us-tum*, *tos-tum*. This answers to the Sanskrit obligatory conversion of a concluding *r* into *s* before an initial *t*, as, भ्रातॄन् माम् *bhrâtas târâya mām*, "brother save me," instead of भ्रातॄन् *bhrâtan* on the other hand, in the middle of words *r* remains unaltered before *t*, hence, for instance, भ्रातॄन् *bhar-tum*, not भ्रातॄन् *bhastum*, "to bear." *L* exhibits in the Latin the forms *fal-sum*, *pul-sum*, *vul-sum*, in contrast to *cul-tum*, *n* exhibits *ten-tum*, *can-tum*, opposed to *man-sum*. The other forms in *n-sum*, except *cen-sum*, have been mulcted of a radical *d*, as *ton-sum*, *pen-sum*.

102. In the Germanic languages, *t* alone gives occasion for an euphonic conversion of a preceding radical consonant, for instance, in the 2d pers. sing. of the strong preterite, where, however, the *t* in the Old High German is retained only in a few verbs, which associate a present signification with the form of the preterite. In the weak preterites, also, which spring from these verbs, the auxiliary *t* where it remains unaltered, generates the same euphonic relations. We find in these forms the Germanic on the same footing as the Greek, in this respect, that it converts radical *t* sounds (*t*, *th*, *d*, and in Old and Middle High German *z* also) before a superadded *t* into *s*. Hence, for instance, in [G Ed p 101] Gothic *mairais-t* (*absidisti*), for *mairait-t*, *far-fals-t* (*phicavisti*), for *far-falth-t*, *ana-baus-t* (*imperasti*), for *ana-baud-t*. In Old and Middle High German *weis-t*, "thou knowest," for *weiz-t*. The Gothic, in forming out of the root *vit*, in the weak preterite, *vis-sa* ("I knew"), instead of

\* The obvious relationship of *torico* with *τέρομαι*, and *तृष्* *trish* from *तृष्* *tarish*, argues the derivation of the latter *r* from *s*. Upon that of *uo* from *उष्* *ush*, see § 97.

*usta*, from *ulta*, resembles, in respect of assimilation, the Latin forms mentioned in § 101, such as *quas sum* for *quas tum* from *quat tum*. The Old High German, however, which also adopts *weis-sa* but from *muoz* makes not *muos sa*, but *muo sa*, corresponds in the latter case, to such Latin forms, as *ca sum*, *clau sum*. The case is different in Old High German with those verbs of the first weak conjugation, which, having their syllables made long generally through two terminating consonants in the preterite apply the *t* of the auxiliary verb directly to the root. Here the transition of *t* into *s* does not occur, but *t*, *z*, and even *d*, remain unaltered and only when another consonant precedes them *t* and *d* are extinguished, *z* on the contrary remains, for instance, *leit ta duxi*, " *li neiz-ta*, *afflix-i*" *ar od ta*, *vastavi*, *wal ta*, *volvi*, *huh ta*, *luxi*, for *luht ta* *hult ta* *flacavi*, for *huld ta*. Of double consonants one only is retained, and of *ch* or *ech* only *h*. Other consonantal combinations remain however, undisturbed, as *ran ta*, " *cicunni*, for *runn ta* *wanh ta*, " *vacillavi*, for *kranch ta* *dah t*, " *rix-i*, for *dacch ta*. The Middle High German follows essentially the same principles, only a simple radical *t* gives way before the auxiliary verb and thus *lei te* is opposed to the Old High German *leit ta*, on the other hand in roots in *ld* and *rd* the *d* may be maintained and the *t* of the auxiliary be surrendered—as *dulde* *ronnari*—unless we admit a division of *dul-de* and consider the *d* as a softened *t*. The change of *g* into *c* (§ 99) is natural but not universal for instance *ane te* *arctavi* for *ang te*, but against this law *b* remains unaltered. [G Ed p 102]

Before the formative suffixes beginning with *t*\* both in Gothic and High German, guttural and labial *t*ues and medials are changed into their aspirates, although the tensis accord with a following *t*. Thus for instance in Gothic *rah tu*

\* With the exception of the High German passive part of the weaker firm which, in the adjunction of its *t* to the root follows the analogy of the pret. above described



"watch," from *vak*, *sauht-t(i)s*, "sickness," from *suk*; *mah-t(i)s*, "might," from *mag*, *ga-skaf-t(i)s*, "creation," from *skap*, *fiagyt-t(i)s*, "betrothment," from *gib*, softened from *gab*; Old High German *suh*, *mah*, *li-skaf*, "creature," *kift*, "gift" The dentals replace the aspirate *th* by the sibilant (*s*), as is the case in Gothic before the pers. character *t* of the preterite, as *th* cannot be combined with *t*. The formation of words, however, affords few examples of this kind under this head comes our *mast*, related to the Gothic *mats*, "food," and *matyan*, "to eat" In Gothic, the *s* of *blōstreis*, "worshipper," springs from the *t* of *blōtan*, "to worship". *beist*, "heaven," comes probably from *beit* (*beitan*, "to bite," Grimm, ii p 208). The Zend accords, in this respect, with the Germanic, but still more with the Greek, in that it converts its *t* sounds into *σ* <sup>3</sup>, not only before *ϕ* *t*, but also before *μ* *m*, for instance, *σθῆτα* *nīsta*, "dead," from the root *σθῆ* *nith*, *σθῆτα* *baīta*, "bound," from *σθῆ* *bandh*, with the nasal excluded; as in Modern Persian *استاد* *bastah*, from *بند* *band*; *استاد* *aēšma*, "wood," from *इध्म* *idhma*.

103 It is a violation of one of the most natural laws of sound, that, in Gothic, the medial *g* does not universally pass into *k* or *h* (= *ch*), before the personal character *t* of [G Ed p 103] the pret., but generally is retained, and we find, for instance, *θg-t*, "thou fearest," *mag-t*, "thou canst," and yet, before other inflections formed with *t*, the *g* undergoes an euphonic transition into *h*, as for instance, *θh-ta*, "I feared," *mah-ts*, "might."

104 When in Sanskrit, according to §. 98, the aspiration of a medial undergoes a necessary suppression, it falls back, under certain conditions and according to special laws, upon the initial consonant of the root, yet only upon a medial, or throws itself onward on the initial consonant of

\* Of the Slavonic and Lithuanian, § 457

† No other roots in *g* in this person are to be found in Ulfilas

the following suffix - We find for instance भाष्यामि *bhot syāmi* "I shall know" for वाचस्यामि *badh syāmi* वेदभूत *vēda bhut*, knowing the vedas for बुध *budh* बुद्ध *bud-dha* knowing for बुध्ता *budhta* धेयामि *dhyāmi* I shall milk for दधेयामि *ddh syāmi* दुग्ध *dug dha* milked for दुहन् *duh ta* In Greek we find a remarkable relic of the first part of the transposition of the aspirate \* in the necessary suppression of the aspirate in some roots which begin with *t* and end with an aspirate before *σ τ*, and *μ* letters which admit of no union with an aspirate and in its being thrown back on the initial letter by which process *τ* becomes *θ* Hence *τρεψω* *θρε-σω* (*θρεψω*) *θρε-τις*, *θρε-μια* *ταφί* *θαπ-τω* *εταφί*, *τεθαμ-μαι* *τριψος* *θρυ-τω* *ετρυφί* *θρυμ-μια* *τρεχω* *θρεξομαι* *θριξ* *τριχος* *ταχυς* *θασσων* In the spirit of this transposition of the aspirate *χ* obtains the spiritus asper when *χ* is obliged to merge in the tenuis (*εκ-ος* *εζω* *εζις*) †

\* See J. L. Barnouf in the *Vatic Journal*, III 1863 and Buttmann pp. 77 78

† It is usual to explain this appearance by the supposition of two aspirations in the root of these forms, of which one only is supposed to appear in reference to the euphonic law which forbids the admission of two consecutive aspirate syllables. This one would be the last {C. F. L. p. 101} if the two and the other would only shew itself when the latter had been forced to merge in the tenuis. Opposed, however to this explanation is the fact that on account of the inconvenience of accumulated aspirates the language has guarded itself in the original formation of its roots against the evil and has never admitted an aspirated consonant at once for the initial and final letter of a root. In Sanskrit, the collection of whose roots is complete there is no such instance. The forms, however *εθ εθγ* *τεθ φθ* *τεθ φθω* *τεθ φ τα* *τεθς* *εθ* *εθρ* *βθγ* present a difficulty. The *ε* perhaps are eccentricities of usage which once habituated to the initial aspiration by its frequent application to supply the place of the terminating one began to assume its reality and extended it wider than was legitimate. We might also say that since *φθ* (as *χθ*) is so favourite a combination in Greek that it is even substituted for *πθ* and *βθ*—while according to § 93, an original *φθ* ought to become *πθ*—on this ground the tendency to aspiration of the root remained unsatisfied by *ερυφθην* &c. and as if the *φ* only existed out of reference to the *θ* the original terminating aspirate necessarily fell on the radical initial. This theory which seems to me sound would only leave *τεθ* *εθ* to be explained

## OF THE ROOTS.

[G Ed p 105] 105. There are in Sanskrit, and the languages which are akin to it, two classes of roots from the one, which is by far the more numerous, spring verbs, and nouns (substantives and adjectives) which stand in fraternal connection with the verbs, not in the relation of descent from them, not begotten by them, but sprung from the same shoot with them. We term them, nevertheless, for the sake of distinction, and according to prevailing custom, Verbal Roots, and the verb, too, stands in close formal connection with them, because from many roots each person of the present is formed by simply adding the requisite personal termination. From the second class spring pronouns, all original prepositions, conjunctions, and particles we name them Pronominal Roots, because they all express a pronominal idea, which, in the prepositions, conjunctions, and particles, lies more or less concealed. No simple pronouns can be carried back, either according to their meaning or their form, to any thing more general, but their declension-theme (or inflective base) is at the same time their root. The Indian Grammarians, however, derive all words, the pronouns included, from verbal roots, although the majority of pronominal bases, even in a formal respect, are opposed to such a derivation, because they, for the most part, end with *a* one, indeed, consists simply of *a*. Among

[G Ed p 106] the verbal roots, however, there is not a single one in *ā*, although long *ā*, and all other vowels, *ai* *au* excepted, occur among the final letters of the verbal roots. Accidental external identity takes place between the verbal and pronominal roots, *e g* *इ* signifies, as a verbal root, "to go," as a pronominal root, "he," "this."

106. The verbal roots, like those of the pronouns, are

monosyllabic and the polysyllabic forms represented by the grammarians as roots contain either a reduplicate-syllable as *वागृज्* 'to wake' or a preposition which has grown up with the root as *अवधीर्* *ava dhur* 'to despise' or they have sprung from a noun like *कुमार* *kumār* 'to play' which I derive from *कुमार* *kumāra* 'a boy'. Except the law of their being monosyllabic the Sanskrit roots are subjected to no further limitation and their one syllableness may present itself under all possible forms in the shortest and most extended as well as those of a middle degree. Thus free state of restriction was necessary as the language was to contain within the limits of one-syllableness the whole body of fundamental ideas. The simple vowels and consonants were not sufficient it was requisite to frame roots also where several consonants combined in inseparable unity became as it were simple sounds e.g. *स्था* *sthā* 'to stand' a root in which the age of the co-existence of the *s* and *th* is supported by the unanimous testimony of all the members of our race of languages. So also in *गच्छ* *śand* 'to go' (Lat. *scand o*) the age of the combination of consonants both in the beginning and ending of the root, is certified by the agreement of the Latin with the Sanskrit. The proposition that in the earliest period of language a simple vowel is sufficient to express a verbal idea is supported by the remarkable concurrence of [G Ed p 107] nearly all the individuals of the Sanskrit family of languages in expressing the idea 'to go' by the root :

107 The nature and peculiarity of the Sanskrit verbal roots explains itself still more by comparison with those of the Semitic languages. These require, as far as we trace back their antiquity three consonants which as I have already elsewhere shewn\* express the fundamental

\* Trans. of the Hist. Phil. Class of the R. A. of Inst. of Berlin for the year 1874 p. 196 &c

idea by themselves alone, without the aid of vowels; and although they may be momentarily compressed into one syllable, still, in this, the combination of the middle radical with the first or last cannot be recognised as original and belonging to the root, because it is only transitory, and chiefly depends on the mechanism of the construction of the word. Thus, in Hebrew, *kátûl*, "slain," in the fem., on account of the addition *âh* contracts itself to *ktûl* (*ktûl-âh*), while *kôtel*, "slaying," before the same addition, compresses itself in an opposite manner, and forms *kôllâh*. Neither *ktûl*, therefore, nor *kôll*, can be regarded as the root, and just as little can it be looked for in *ktôl*, as the *status constructus* of the infinitive, for this is only a shortening of the absolute form *kâtôl*, produced by a natural tendency to pass hastily to the word governed by the infinitive, which, as it were, has grown to it. In the imperative *ktôl* the abbreviation is not external, subject to mechanical conditions, but rather dynamic, and occasioned by the hurry with which a command is usually enunciated. In the Semitic languages, in decided opposition to those of the Sanskrit family, the vowels belong, not to the root, but to the grammatical motion, the secondary ideas, and the mechanism of the construction of

[G Ed p 108] the word. By them, for example, is distinguished, in Arabic, *katala*, "he slew," from *kutula*, "he was slain", and in Hebrew, *kôtel*, "slaying," from *kâtûl*, "slain". A Semitic root is unpronounceable, because, in giving it vowels, an advance is made to a special grammatical form, and it then no longer possesses the simple peculiarity of a root raised above all grammar. But in the Sanskrit family of languages, if its oldest state is consulted in the languages which have continued most pure, the root appears as a circumscribed nucleus, which is almost unalterable, and which surrounds itself with foreign syllables, whose origin we must investigate, and whose destination is, to express the secondary ideas of grammar which the root itself cannot express

The vowel with one or more consonants and sometimes without any consonant whatever belongs to the fundamental meaning it can be lengthened to the highest degree or raised by *Guna* or *Vriddhi* and this lengthening or raising and more lately the retention of an original *a* opposed to its weakening to *i* or change to *u* (§§ 66 67) belongs not to the denoting of grammatical relations which require to be more clearly pointed out but as I imagine I can prove only to the mechanism the symmetry of construction

108 As the Semitic roots on account of their construction possess the most surprising capacity for indicating the secondary ideas of grammar by the mere internal moulding of the root of which they also make extensive use while the Sanskrit roots at the first grammatical movement are compelled to assume external additions so must it appear strange that *F. von Schlegel*\* while he [G Ed p 109] divides languages in general into two chief races of which the one denotes the secondary intentions of meaning by an internal alteration of the sound of the root by inflexion, the other always by the addition of a word which may by itself signify plurality past time what is to be in future or other relative ideas of that kind allots the Sanskrit and its sisters to the former race and the Semitic languages to the second. There may indeed" he writes p 48 arise an appearance of inflexion when the annexed particles are melted down with the chief word so as to be no longer distinguishable but where in a language as in the Arabic and in all which are connected with it, the first and most important relations as those of the person to verbs are denoted by the addition of particles which have a meaning for themselves individually and the tendency to which suffixes shews itself deeply seated in the language it may there be safely assumed that the same may have

---

\* In his work on the language and wisdom of the Indians

occurred in other positions, where the annexation of particles of a foreign nature no longer admits of such clear discrimination one may at least safely assume that the language, on the whole, belongs to this chief race, although in this single point, by admixture or artificial adornment, it has adopted another and a higher character." We must here preliminarily observe, that, in Sanskrit and the languages connected with it, the personal terminations of the verbs shew at least as great a similarity to isolated pronouns as in Arabic. How should any language, which expresses the pronominal relations of the verbs by syllables annexed either at the beginning or end of the word, in the choice of these syllables avoid, and not rather select, those which, in their isolated state, also express the corresponding

[G Ed p 110] pronominal ideas? By inflexion, F. von Schlegel understands the internal alteration of the sound of the root, or (p 35) the internal modification of the root, which he (p 48) opposes to addition from without. But when from  $\delta\omicron$  or  $\delta\omega$ , in Greek, comes  $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\text{-}\mu\iota$ ,  $\delta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\sigma\omega$ ,  $\delta\omicron\text{-}\theta\eta\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ , what are the forms  $\mu\iota$ ,  $\sigma\omega$ ,  $\theta\eta\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ , but palpable external additions to the root, which is not at all internally altered, or only in the quantity of the vowel? If, then, by inflexion, an internal modification of the root is to be understood, the Sanskrit and Greek &c have in that case except the reduplication, which is supplied by the elements of the root itself—scarcely any inflexion at all to shew. If, however,  $\theta\eta\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$  is an external modification of the root  $\delta\omicron$ , simply because it is combined with it, touches it, with it expresses a whole, then the idea of sea and continent may be represented as an internal modification of the sea, and *vice versâ*. P 50, F von Schlegel remarks "In the Indian or Grecian language every root is truly that which the name says, and like a living germ, for since the ideas of relation are denoted by internal alteration, freer room is given for development, the fulness of which can be indefinitely

extended and is in fact often wondrously rich. All, however which in this manner proceeds from the simple root still retains the stamp of its relationship adheres to it and thus reciprocally bears and supports itself. I find however the inference not established for from the capability of expressing ideas of relation by internal alteration of the root, how can the capability be deduced of surrounding the (internally unalterable) root indefinitely, with foreign syllables externally added? What kind of stamp of relationship is there between  $\mu\iota\sigma\omega\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$  and the [G Ed p 111] roots to which these significative additions are appended? We therefore recognise in the inflexions of the Sanskrit family of languages no internal involutions of the root but elements of themselves significative and the tracing of the origin of which is the task of scientific grammar. But even if the origin of not a single one of these inflexions could be traced with certainty, still the principle of the formation of grammar by external addition, would not, for that reason, be the less certain because at the first glance in the majority of inflexions, one discovers at least so much, that they do not belong to the root but have been added from without. A W von Schlegel also who, in essential points, assents to the above mentioned division of languages\* gives us to understand, with regard to the so-called

\* Nevertheless in his work *Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales* p 14 &c he gives three classes viz *Les langues sans aucune structure grammaticale les langues qui emploient des affixes et les langues à inflexions*. Of the latter he says *Je pense cependant qu'il faut assigner le premier rang aux langues à inflexions. On pourroit les appeler les langues organiques parce qu'elles renferment un principe vivant de développement et d'accroissement et qu'elles ont seules si je puis m'exprimer ainsi une végétation abondante et féconde. Le merveilleux artifice de ces langues est de former une immense variété de mots et de marquer la liaison des idées que ces mots désignent, moyennant un assez petit nombre de syllabes qui considérées séparément n'ont point de signification*



inflexions, that they are not modifications of the root, but foreign additions, whose characteristic lies in this, that [G Ed p. 112] regarded, *per se*, they have no meaning. In the Semitic, the appended grammatical syllables or inflexions have no meaning, at least in so far that they do not, any more than in Sanskrit, occur isolated in a completely similar state. In Arabic, for instance, *antum*, and not *tum*, is said for "ye", and in Sanskrit *ma*, *ta*, and not *m*, *t*, are the declinable bases of the first and third person, and *at-Ti*, "he eats," has the same relation to *TA-m*, "him," that in Gothic *IT-a*, "I eat," has to the monosyllabic *AT*, "I ate." The reason for weakening the *a* of the base to *i* is probably, in the different cases of the two sister languages, the same, viz the greater extent of the form of word with *i* (comp. §. 6.) If, then, the division of languages made by F von Schlegel is untenable, on the reasons on which it is founded, still there is much ingenuity in the thought of a natural history or classification of languages. We prefer, however, to present, with A. W. von Schlegel (l. c), three classes, and distinguish them as follows: first, languages with monosyllabic roots, without the capability of composition, and hence without organism, without grammar. This class comprises Chinese, where all is hitherto bare root, and the grammatical categories, and secondary relations after the

---

fication, mais qui déterminent avec précision le sens du mot auquel elles sont jointes. En modifiant les lettres radicales, et en ajoutant aux racines des syllabes dérivatives, on forme de mots dérivés de diverses espèces, et des dérivés des dérivés. On compose des mots de plusieurs racines pour exprimer les idées complexes. Ensuite on déclina les substantifs, les adjectifs, et les pronoms, par genres, par nombres, et par cas, on conjugue les verbes par voix, par modes, par temps, par nombres, et par personnes, en employant de même des désinences et quelquefois des augmens qui, séparément, ne signifient rien. Cette méthode procure l'avantage d'énoncer en un seul mot l'idée principale, souvent déjà très-modifiée et très-complexe, avec tout son cortège d'idées accessones et de relations variables.

main point can only be discovered from the position of the roots in the sentence\* Secondly languages with monosyllabic roots which are capable of combination, and obtain their organism and grammar nearly in this way alone. The chief principle of the formation of words, in this class, appears to me to lie in the combination of verbal and pronominal roots, which together represent [G Ed p 113] as it were body and soul (Comp § 100) To this class belongs the Sanskrit family of languages and moreover all other languages, so far as they are not comprehended under 1 and 3 and have maintained themselves in a condition which renders it possible to trace back their forms of words to the simplest elements. Thirdly, languages with dissyllabic verbal roots, and three necessary consonants as single vehicles of the fundamental meaning. This class comprehends merely the Semitic languages and produces its grammatical forms, not simply by combination, like the second class but by a mere internal modification of the roots. We here gladly award to the Sanskrit family of languages a great superiority over the Semitic, which we do not, however, find in the use of inflexions as syllables *per se* devoid of meaning but in the copiousness of these grammatical additions which are really significative and connected with words used isolated in the judicious, ingenious selection and application of them, and the accurate and acute defining of various relations, which hereby becomes possible finally in the beautiful adjustment of these additions to a harmonious whole which bears the appearance of an organized body.

109\* The Indian Grammarians divide the roots according to properties, (which extend only to the tenses which

---

We find this view of the Chinese admirably elucidated in W von Humboldt's talented pamphlet *Lettre à M Abel Remusat sur la nature des formes grammaticales en general et sur le genie de la langue chinoise*

I call the special tenses, and to the part pres.,) into ten classes, all of which we have re-discovered in the Zend also, and examples of which are given in the following paragraph.

[G. Ed p 114] We shall here give the characteristics of the Sanskrit classes, and compare with them those which correspond in the European sister languages

(1.) The first and sixth class add *अ a* to the root; and we reserve the discussion of the origin of this and other conjugational affixes for the disquisition on the verb. The point of difference between the first class of nearly 1000 roots (almost the half of the entire number) and the sixth class, which contains about 130 roots, lies in this, that the former raise the vowel of the root by Guna (§. 26), while the latter retain it pure, e.g. बोधति *bôdhati*, "he knows," from बुध् *budh* (1), तुदति *tudati*, "he vexes" (comp *tunditi*) from तुद् *tud* (6) As *अ a* has no Guna, no discrimination can take place through this vowel between the classes 1. and 6 but nearly all the roots which belong to either, having *अ a* as the radical vowel, are reckoned in the first class. In Greek, *c* (before nasals *o*, §. 3.) corresponds to the affix *अ a*, and *λείπ-ο-μεν*,† *φεύγ-ο-μεν*, from *ΛΙΠ*, *ΦΥΓ* (*ἐλπιν*, *ἐφυγον*), belong to the first class, because they have Guna (§. 26), while, e.g. *θίγ-ο-μεν*, *θλίβ-ο-μεν*, &c, fall under the sixth class || In Latin we recognise, in the third conjugation,

\* In Greek, the present (indic imper. and optat., the form of the Greek subjunct is wanting in Sanskrit) and imperfect correspond to them, beyond which certain conjugation-signs do not extend In German, the present of every mood corresponds

† The accent here distinguishes the 1st cl from the 6th e.g. for *patati* did it belong to the 6th cl, we should have *patâti*

‡ We give the plural, because the singular, on account of abbreviation, makes the thing less perspicuous

|| Sanskrit long vowels admit Guna only when they occur at the end of the root, but in the beginning and middle remain without admixture of the *अ a*, so do short vowels before double consonants

which I would raise to the first, the cognate of the Sanskrit first and sixth class, since we regard the addition *i* as a weakening of the old *a* (§ 8) and *e g legimus* has the same relation to *λε, ο μεν* that the genitive *pedis* has to *ποδ* or where the Sanskrit has likewise *a* (पद् [G Ed p 115] *pad-as*) In *legunt* from *leg-ant* the old *a* through the influence of the liquid has become *u* (Comp § 66) In German all the primitive (strong) verbs with the exception of some remains of the fourth class (No 2) stand in clear connection with the Sanskrit first class which is here, for the first time laid down in its full extent\*. The *a* which is added to the root has in Gothic†, before some personal terminations, remained unchanged before others according to § 67 and as in Latin been weakened to *i* so *hail a*, I am called *hail i s hail i th* 2d pers du *hail a ts* pl *hail a m, hail i th hail a nd* The radical vowels *i* and *u* keep the Gunā addition as in Sanskrit only that the *a* which gives the Gunā is here weakened to *i* (§ 27) which with *ā* radical *i* is aggregated into a long *i* (written *ei* § 70) hence *keina* (= *kina* from *kuna*) I germinate, from *हृण* *bhugn* I bend from *BLG* Sanskrit *भृ* *bhuy* whence *भृण* *bhugn* bent The diphthongs *ai au* as in Sanskrit *ए* and *औ* (§ 2) are incapable of any Gunā ns are *e* (= *ए* § 69) and *a* The Sanskrit radical vowel *a* has however in Gothic experienced a threefold destiny It has either remained unaltered in the special tenses and is lengthened in the preterite except in reduplicate roots (*i e* to *o*, see § 69)—

\* I have already, in my Review of Grimm's Grammar, expressed the conjecture that the *a* of forms like *haila, kutam, I utama* &c does not belong to the personal termination but is identical with the *a* of the Sanskrit 1st and 6th classes but I was not then clear regarding the *U*na in the present in all roots with vowels capable of Gunā (S c Ann Rig for Crit of Litt Book II p 282 and 289)

† We may frequent mention of the Gothic alone as the true starting point and limit of German Grammar The implication to the High German will hereafter present itself

(2) The fourth class of Sanskrit roots adds to them the syllable *ya*, and herein agrees with the special tenses of the passive, and from the roots which belong to it spring chiefly neuter verbs, as *e g* नश्यति *naśyati*, "he perishes." Their number amounts altogether to about 130. The German has preserved one unmistakeable remnant of this class, in those strong verbs which again lay aside, in the preterite, the syllable *ya* (weakened to *yi*), which is added to the root in the [G Ed p 117] special tenses, *e g* *vahts-ya* (Zend *vahts-ya*, *ucs-yann*, "crescebant," Vendidad S p 257), "cresco," *vahts-yi-th*, "crescit," pret. *vôhts*

\* Occurs only with the prep *and*, and with the meaning "to scold," but corresponds to the Old High German root *BIZ*, "to bite"

(3) The second, third, and seventh classes add the personal termination direct to the root but in the cognate European languages to facilitate the conjugation, these classes have mainly passed over to the first class *e g* *edimus* not *ed mus* (as a remnant of the old construction *es t, es-tis*) Gothic *it a m*, Old High German *is-a mēs* not *is mēs* answering to the Sanskrit *अहम् ad-mos* The second class to which *अट ad* belongs leaves the root without any characteristic addition with Gun of the vowels capable of Gun before light terminations, which must be hereafter explained, hence *e g* *एभि* *ēmi* corresponding to *इमस् imas* from *इ* to *go* as in Greek *εἶμι* to *ἵμι* It contains not more than about seventy roots partly terminating in consonants, partly in vowels In this and the third-class the Greek exhibits roots almost entirely ending in vowels as the above mentioned *Ι* *4A*, *ΓΝΩ* (*γιῶ-θι*) *ΔΩ* *ΣΤΑ*, *ΟΗ*, *ΦΥ* (*ἔφυι*) *ΔΥ* &c To the consonants the direct combination with the consonants of the termination has become too heavy, and *ΕΣ* alone (because of the facility of *σμ στ*) has remained in the Sanskrit second class, as the corresponding root in Latin Lithuanian and German Hence *अस्ति asti* *एस्ति est* Lithuan *esti* *est* Gothic and High German *ist* In the Latin there fall also to the second class *I DA STA FLA FA* and *NA* and also *in quam* whence *QUA* weakened to *QUI* is the root which in Gothic appears as *QUAT* weakened to *QUIT* with the recreation of a *T* *FER* and *IFL* (*IUL*) have preserved some persons of the ancient construction \* [G Ed p 118] The third class is distinguished from the second by a syllable of reduplication in the special tenses and has maintained itself under this form in Greek also and Lithuanian In

\* Five roots of the second class introduce in Sanskrit, between the consonants of the root and the personal termination, an *इ*, as *रोदिमि rōd i mi* I weep from *रुद rud* I can however, no longer believe that the *i* of the Latin third conjug is connected with this *इ* as there is scarce any doubt of its relationship with the *अ* of the very copious first class

Sanskrit it comprehends about twenty roots, *e.g.* ददामि *dadāmi*, दीदωμι, Lithuanian *dudu*; दधामि *dadhāmi*, τίθημι (§ 16.), जजामि *jajanmi*, "I beget," comp γί-γν-ο-μαι. The seventh class, of about twenty-four roots, introduces, in the special tenses, a nasal into the root, which is extended before the light personal terminations to the syllable *na*; *e.g.* भिनक्षि *bhinadmi*, "I cleave," भि-क्ष् *bhināmi*, "we cleave." The Latin has kept the weaker form of this nasalization, but has further added to the root the affix of the first class (p 111 G. Ed), hence *findo*, *find-i-mus*. From the Greek come to be here considered roots, like ΜΑΘ, ΑΑΒ, ΘΙΓ, in which the inserted nasal has been repeated further on in the word, with the prefixed *a*, and, like the Latin *find-i-mus*, is connected with the affix of the first class, thus, μανθ-άν-ο-μεν, λαμβ-άν-ο-μεν, θιγγ-άν-ο-μεν.

(4) The fifth class, of about thirty roots, has *nu*; and the eighth, with ten roots, which, excepting कृ *krī*, "to make," all terminate in न् *n* or ण् *ṇ*, has *u* for its characteristic addition the *u*, however, of these two classes is lengthened before the light terminations by Guna, which, in the corresponding Greek appended syllables, *vu* and *v*, is supplied by lengthening the *v*, thus, *e.g.* δέκινυμι, δέκινυμεν, as in Sanskrit अदिपि *āp-nō-mi*, "ad-*ip-is-son*," आदिपुनस् *āp-nu-mas*, "adipisum." An example of the eighth class is तन् *tan*, "to extend," whence तनोमि *tan-ō-mi* = तάν-ū-μι, तनुमस् *tan-u-mas* = तάν-ū-μcs. With the उ *u*, *v*, of the eighth class, is probably connected

[G Ed p 119] the *v* in some Gothic strong verbs, where, however, it adheres so firmly to the root, that, in a German point of view, it must be regarded as a radical. Hence it is not dropped in the preterite, and receives, in the special tenses, like all strong verbs, the affix of the Sanskrit first class, *e.g.* *sahva*,\* "I see," *sahv*, "I saw."

(5) The ninth class adds न् *nā* to the root, which syllable, before heavy terminations, instead of being shortened

\* I now consider the *v* of *sahva* and similar verbs as purely euphonic, cf § 86 and Latin forms like *cogno*, *linguo*, *stinguo*

to न ra replaces the heavy ञ d by the lighter ई i (§ 6) and is thus weakened to नी ni I g from मृद् mrid to erushi (comp mordeo) comes मृदनामि mridnamī मृदनीमस् mridnīmas In this is easily perceived the relationship with Greek formations in ημι (iāmi) ιαμιν e g δαμνημι, δαμναμει As α, ε, and ο are originally one formations like τεμιομιν belong to this class only that they have wandered into the more modern ω conjugation at a remote period of antiquity for more lately ιω would not have become ω from ημι

(6) The tenth class adds अय aya to the root but is distinguished from the other classes in this further important point that this affix is not limited to the special tenses the final a of अय aya is peculiar to them but अय ay extends with very few exceptions to all the other formations of the root All causals and many denominatives follow this class and indeed from every root a causal can be formed by the addition अय ay which is always accompanied by Guna of the middle vowel of the root capable of Guna or by Vriddhi of every radical final vowel and of a naddle a belonging to the root e g वेदयति véd aya ti he makes to know from विद् vid वाचयति vācayati aya ti he makes to hear from श्रु sru We recognise in German the affix अय aya at least in two shapes in the one [G Ed p 190] the first a in the other the last is lost and in the latter case y has become i so that I have no longer any scruple in tracing back Grimm's first and third conjugation of the weak form to a common origin According to all probability however the verbs with the affix d also (as Old High German manōn to mention to make to think, ) belong to this class, regarding which we will speak further under the verb The Old High German gives ē as the contraction of a + i, (see § 78) but retains its ē more firmly than the Gothic its ai which in several persons, sinks into a simple a Compare Gothic haba habam habund with Old High German hapēm hapēmes hapent Very remarkable however is the concurrence of the Prakrit with the Old High German and the Latin



of the 2d conj in this point, that it in like manner has contracted the affix अय *aya* to एद् Compare Sanskrit मानयामि *mānayāmi*, "I honour," Prākṛit माणेमि *māṇēmi*,\* Old High German, *var-manēm*, "I despise," Latin *monco*.

[G Ed. p 121]

SANSKRIT	PRĀKRIT	OLD HIGH GERMAN	LATIN
मानयामि <i>mānayāmi</i>	माणेमि <i>māṇēmi</i>	<i>var-manēm</i>	<i>monco</i>
मानयसि <i>mānayasi</i>	माणेसि <i>māṇēsī</i>	<i>manēs</i>	<i>monēs</i>
मानयति <i>mānayati</i>	माणेदि <i>māṇēdi</i>	<i>manēt</i>	<i>monet</i>
मानयामस् <i>mānayāmas</i>	माणेम्ह <i>māṇēmha</i>	<i>manēmes</i>	<i>monēmus</i>
मानयथ <i>mānayatha</i>	माणेथ <i>māṇēdha</i>	<i>manēt</i>	<i>monētis</i>
मानयन्ति <i>mānayanti</i>	माणेन्ति <i>māṇēnti</i>	<i>manēnt</i>	<i>monent</i>

In regard to those weak verbs, which have suppressed the first vowel of the Sanskrit अय *aya*, and give therefore *ya* as affix, we will here further recall attention to the forms *iga* (*ige*), which occasionally occur in Old High German and Anglo Saxon, whose connection with अय *aya* is to be traced thus, that the semi-vowel *y* has become hardened to *g*, (comp §. 19), and the preceding *a* weakened to *i*. In Greek, the cognate verbs to the Sanskrit of the tenth class are to

I am not at present able to adduce this verb from the edited texts it is, however, certain, that *mānayāmi* in this dialect can have no other sound but *māṇēmi*. The conjugation is supported by other examples of this class, as *chintēmi*, "I think" (from *chantayāmi*), *niśēmi* (from *niśdayāmi*). In the plural the termination *mha* is nothing else than the appended verb substantive (Sansk. *smas*, "we are") In the third pers pl, together with *mānenti* the forms *mānaanti* and *mānanti* are also admissible. The Indian Grammarians assume for the Sanskrit a root *mān*, "to honour" more probably, however, the verb, for which this root is supplied, is only a denominative from *māna*, "honour"; and this substantive itself a derivation from *man*, "to think," whence *ava man*, "to despise," as in Old High German *var-MAN* (by Otfrid, *fir-MON*) The root, therefore, which is contained in *var-manēm* is identical with the Gothic *MAN* (*man*, "I mean," "I think," pl *munum* see § 66) To this class belongs, also, the Latin *monere*, as, "to make to think" (Old High German *manōn*), the radical *o* for *a* of which we explain by the principle of § 66 (see, also, §. 3), while the *i* of *memin-i* is a weakening of the original *a*, explained by § 6

be looked for in those in *aw ew, ow*, in Latin besides the 2d conjugation compared above most verbs of the 1st and 4th also belong to this affinity. We shall recur to them when speaking of the verb.

109 In order to adduce single examples of the multifarious construction of the roots let us examine the order of the final letters but we will select only such examples as are common to the Sanskrit and several sister languages. The greatest forbearance however is requisite as an authenticated comparison of all that admits of comparison would easily swell to a book, which shall hereafter be devoted to this subject\*.

(1) Roots ending with a vowel — [G 11 p 1.]

There are as has been already remarked (§ 105) no roots in *ta* but roots in *ta* are numerous. Thus *ग'ग'†* "to go," contained in the Latin *non-ignare* also perhaps in *fuligare* the first member of which belongs to *fatire* or *fecire* in Greek *βίβημι* answers to *गमिष्ये* and rests on the frequent interchange of gutturals and labials. Gothic *ga þ'ed* "a street" (see p 107 G 1d) and *gawō gāti* "a place" (nom. *awawō gītus* Old High German *gīm*

I go = *गमिष्ये* *gi m* not therefore as Grimm conjectures (p 869) by syncope\* from *jangu* but, with a more ancient and regular foundation, only with a suppression of the Sanskrit syllable of reduplication introduced therefore from the third into the second class (see p 117 G 1d) as in Latin *da-mus* answering to *δίδωμεν*. Thus also, *slā m slis slit* in like manner with suppressed reduplication corresponds to *ἵστημι* (for *σίστημι*) and to the Sanskrit root *स्था slā* which is irregularly inflected *तिष्ठामि tishthāmi* *तिष्ठसि tishthasi* *तिष्ठति tishthati* for *tasthāmi tasthāsi tasthāti*

Somewhat that pertains to this subject I have already put together very concisely at the end of my Sanskrit Glossary.

† The attached cyphers denote the classes described in § 109.

which will be more closely considered hereafter. The Latin, in root and inflexion, most resembles the Old High German the Zend, however, in its *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *histāmi*\* (for *sistāmi*, see § 53), appears in a genuine Greek dress. Observe, also, the *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *ratha'stāo*, "warrior," which occurs so often in the Zend-Avesta, properly "chariot stander," with *o* for *s* as the sign of the nominative. How, then, in Old High German, comes from *STAN* the extended form of the root *STANT*, whence the present *stantu*, "I stand," and preterite *stuont*, "I or he stood", for which the Gothic has *standa*, *stāth*? We will here only preliminarily remark, that we have observed in Zend also, in some roots terminating in *ā*, an inclination to connect themselves with a *t*-sound. Thus we find, from *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *śnā*, "to wash," "to purify," (Sansk *शान्*, "to bathe,") whence *śnāta*, "purified," in Vend S. p. 233, frequently *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *fra-śnādhyāyēn* "laurent", from *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *dā*, "to lay," (Sansk *धा* *dhā*, p. 118 G. Ed.), we find *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *nidāthyānn*, "deponant" (as Vendidad S. pp. 205 and 206, *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *hushē zēmē nidāthyānn*, "in viciā terrā deponant") from the same root we find the imperative

[G. Ed. p. 123] form, *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *ni-dā-thāma*, "deponamus" (Vend S. p. 208, *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *kva naranm vītanannm tanūm barāma Ahura mazda hva nidāthāma*, "Quo hominum mortuorum corpus feramus, ubi deponamus"?). Of the Germanic we will further remark, that the root *𐌱𐌰* *mā*, "to measure" (cf. *μέτρον*), has connected itself with a *t*-sound, and forms, in Gothic, *MAT*, present *mita* (§. 109<sup>1</sup> 1). *𐌱𐌰𐌶𐌰* *gnā*, "to be acquainted with," "to know," *𐌱𐌰𐌶𐌰* *GNA* (*gnarus*) Old High German *CHNĀ* (§ 87), whence *chnā-ta*, "I knew," annexing the auxiliary verb direct, as in Latin (*g*)*no-vi*. To

\* I believe I may deduce this form from the 3d pers. pl. *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *histēnti* (cf. *ισταντι*) in the V S p. 183. more on this head under the verb

the special form नानामि *ñānāmi* for नानामि *ñā nā mi* may be long the Gothic root *ĀĀN* Old High German *CHANN* (*lann chan* "I know" see § 94 *lunnam chunnum* "we know" see § 66) ध्म<sup>1</sup> *dhmā* to blow alters itself in the special forms to ध्म *dhm* Latin *PLA* according to the second class (§ 109 3) Old High German *PLA* (§§ 12 20) whence *plā ta* "fall" As in Sanskrit from the above-mentioned ध्म *dhm* comes the nominal base धमनी *dhamañi* "a vein" so may the Gothic base *BLOTHA* (now *neclōth* blood) come here also under consideration We pass on to roots in *r* and have to remark that the root mentioned at p 107 G Ed ३, to go is not unknown in German We find it in the Gothic imperative *hur-i* "come here" *du hur-yats* pl *hur-yith* I believe too that in the irregular preterite *iddya* "I went" the *r* alone can be assumed as the root In Zend occurs *अगच्छाति* *agacchati* "he goes" (from *एति* *eti* according to §§ 23 41) Lithuan *eti* *eti* *eti* *sri* to go with the prep *उत्* *ut* to raise itself hence *उच्छिष्ट* *uchchirita* raised high compare *cre-sco* *cre-ti* (see § 21) Old High German *SCRIF* to step with the addition of a *t* as in the case of *mat* from *म* *mā* perhaps the Latin *gradior* as well as *cre-sco* might be here included the Guna form of the vowel as in *अगच्छा* *agacchati* "he goes" being observed *स्मि* *smi* to smile Old High German *SMIL* *स्मि* *pri* to love Zend *अस्मि* *asmi* (§ 47) Goth *fruyd* "I love" (§ 57) compare *स्मि* *priya* dear *भी* *bhi* to fear *बिभेहि* *bibhēmi* "I fear" Lithuan *biyau* Gothic *fiya* "I hate" (*fiyais* *fiyath*), *fiyands* foe Old High German *vēm* or *fiēm* "I hate" the Greek *φειδομαι* answers to the Sanskrit reduplication of *bibhēmi* so that contrary to the common rule the aspirates have remained in the prefix, but in the base itself have become medials and thus has left only *β* as the whole root, as in Sanskrit *दा* *dā mas* "we give," for *दा* *dā mas* *दे* *do-mas* Perhaps, also, [G Ed p 124] *φιδ* *φειδομαι* is to be referred to the roots in *i*, so that an



for *scriru* *scri* for *scrier*) like the Greek κλη στω, κικλη κα &c. The Latin *clamo* however has the same relation to च्राव् *srāu* that *mare* has to चारि *lāri* water (§ 63) and ध्रुव् to द्रु *drau* from द्रु *dru* to run १७ *hu*<sup>5</sup> to extol to glorify (अप्यपु *huanda* 'he celebrated' V S p 39) is probably the root of the Greek υμιος (*ūm(c)ios*) which I do not like to regard as an irregular derivative from उद्व *pu*<sup>19</sup> 'to purify' *PŪrus*. This root is the verbal parent of the wind and fire which are both represented as pure पवन *paraana* (with Guna and *ana* [G Ed p 120] as suffix) is the wind and the corresponding Gothic *FŌLA* (neut nom acc *fon* see § 116) is fire which in Sanskrit is called पावक *pāu-a la* with Viuddhi and *ala* as suffix. The relation of *FŌLA* to पवन *paraana* resembles that of the Latin *mālo* from *maolo* the loss of the syllable प *la* is replaced by the lengthening of the *a* (§ 69). The Greek τῦρ and Old High German *ITURA* (nom acc. *iur*) the latter with weakened Guna (§ 27) and *ra* as suffix both fall to the root पृष् *brū* to speak Zend *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 mrū* (e g *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 mrad-m* I spoke V S p 123) the Greek πε(ρ)ω rests on the Guna form परोशि *brai i mi* and has as often happens lost the former of two initial consonants (cf also *pew* *peuω* and *ruo* with रु *sru* to flow"). The Old High German *SPRAH* or *SPRAHII* (*sprithu* 'I speak' *sprah* I spoke) appears to have proceeded from पृष् *brai* by hardening the प *v* (see § 19) and prefixing an *s* akin to the *p* स *bhu* to be Zend *𐬵𐬀 bu* Lithuan *BU* (future *būsu* I will be), Latin *IU* Greek ΦΥ. Probably also, BY in *περσ βυ-ς*, *περσβυτης*, &c, is only another form of this root (cf § 18), so that *περς* would have to be regarded as a preposition from *πο* (π *pra*) essentially distinguished only by a euphonic Σ (cf § 96). Moreover the base *περσβυ* has a striking resemblance to पृष् *prabhu* (*excelsus augustus*) literally being before. In Old High German *pim* or *bim* corresponds to the

Sanskrit भवामि *bhavāmi*. more exact, however, is the correspondence in the plural of *pir-u-mēs*, *pir-u-t*, to *bhav-ā-ma*, "sumus," *bhav-a-tha*, "estis" (see §. 19.). To this class belongs, also, *PŪ*, "to dwell" (*pū-ta*, "I dwelt"), as the Sanskrit वस *vas* "to dwell," in German *VAS*, *WAS*, has become *seyn*. In Sanskrit, too, from भू *bhū*, "to be," comes the substantive *bhav-ana* "house," as place of being. The Gothic *baua*, "I build," may be regarded as the causal of the idea "to be," like the Latin *facio* (§ 19.). its conjugation answers also to भावयामि *bhāvayāmi*, "I make to be," which, in Piākrit, may sound *bhāvēmi*, *bhāvēsi*, *bhāvēti* (Gothic *baua*, *bauais*, *bauait*) See p. 121 G. Ed. Sanskrit roots ending in diphthongs (र ई, ओ ऒ, ऐ औ, there are no roots in औ *du*) follow in their formations, in many respects, the analogy of roots in अ *ā*. We abstain from adducing examples of them, as they also offer little occasion for comparison.

(2.) Roots terminating with a consonant. We shall give [G Ed p 126] only a few examples, in which we compare roots with the same vowel, and proceed in the order, *a*, *i*, *u*. According to § 1 we do not allow the vowel अ *i* and अ *ī* to belong to the root. Long radical vowels before a final consonant are rare; and the majority of them are probably not original.

The most numerous class of roots ending with a consonant has a medial अ *a*. So वच<sup>12</sup> *vach*, Zend *vach* (अवदत्त *adāta*, "dixit," Vend S. p 124), Greek ΕΠ for FEP (§. 14), Latin *VOC*, Old High German, *WAH*, *WAG* (*ki-wahu*, "mentionem facio," pret. *ki-wuoh* pl *ki-wuogumēs*). प्रच<sup>6</sup> *prachh*, Zend *pērēš*, Gothic *FRAH*, pres पृच्छामि *prichchāmi*, पृच्छामि *pērēšāmi*, *frāha* for *frīha* (see § 52 and § 109<sup>a</sup>. 1.), the Latin *ROG* (*rogo*, *interrogo*) appears to be abbreviated from *FROG* पत<sup>1</sup> *pat*, "to fall," "to fly," Zend *pat*, "to fly" (Vend S p 257 *yafīd* *patann* *uvara* *ucsyann*, "where birds fly, trees grow"). One sees clearly from this

that in Greek  $\pi\iota\tau\omega$   $\pi\epsilon\tau\omega$   $\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$   $\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$   $\pi\tau\eta\mu\iota$  &c belong to a common root **PEṬ** Latin *PET* *peto im peto prapetes penna* by assimilation for *pet na* In Gothic *FATH*, or, with the vowel weakened, *FITH*, might be looked for To the latter corresponds according to § 87 Old High German *VED* in *ved aia* feather वद्<sup>1 10</sup> *vad* to speak Latin *VAD* contained in *vas vad is* From वद् *vad* proceeds the abbreviated form उद् *ud* to which pertains  $\Upsilon\Delta$  ( $\upsilon\delta\omega$   $\upsilon\delta\epsilon\omega$   $\upsilon\delta\eta\varsigma$ ) The Old High German gives *WAZ* (*var wazu maledico*) with *z* for *d* according to § 87 and the vowel of the base lengthened as in वादयामि *vādayami* according to the tenth class सद्<sup>6</sup> *sad* to sink with the prep नि *ni* to set oneself down" Latin *SED SID, sideo sedeo* Greek  $\epsilon\Delta$   $\iota\zeta$   $\epsilon\omicron\omicron\varsigma$   $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\alpha$   $\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  Gothic *SAT* (§ 87) *sita* I sit (p 116 G Ed) अन्<sup>2</sup> *an* to blow to breathe अनिल *anila* wind Gothic *AN usana* I expire cf  $\alpha\nu\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  *animus* जन<sup>3</sup> *jan* to beget Zend  $\text{𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭}$  *zan* (§ 58)  $\text{𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀}$  *zazāmi* I beget Sanskrit जनमि *jayanmi* Greek **TEN** Latin *GEN* ( $\gamma\iota\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\iota$   $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  *gigno genus*) Gothic *KIN* 'to germinate' (p 116 G Ed) *kun* gender (§ 66) कर्<sup>8</sup> *kar* (क *kri*) *e g* कलेन *karoti facit* this root in Zend follows the fifth class *e g*  $\text{𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀}$  *kerenabiti* (§ 41) *facit*  $\text{𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀}$  *kerenaut fecit*  $\text{𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀}$  *kerenuidhi fac* Old High German *kara-* *uan* or *garauan* to prepare Latin *creo cura* (cf कुरु *kuru fac*) *ceremonia* and with *p* for *c* (§ 14), *paro* Greek  $\kappa\rho\alpha\iota\omega$   $\kappa\rho\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$  with  $\pi$ ,  $\pi\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega$   $\pi\rho\alpha\kappa\sigma\omega$  [G Ed p 127]  $\pi\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\alpha$  where the guttural appears to be a hardening of the  $\text{क्}$  (§ 19) *e g* of कुर्वन्ति *kurianti faciunt* (from *kur u-* *anti*) वह<sup>1</sup> *vah* to drive to carry Zend  $\text{𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀}$  *vaz* (§ 57) Latin *VEH* Greek  $\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$  wagon as bearer carrier for  $\text{φοχος}$  अस्<sup>1</sup> *vas* to breathe cf *spiro* according to §§ 50 and 22 ग्रह<sup>9 10</sup> *grah* to take the original form occurring in the Vedas is ग्रब् *grabh* To this the Zend form belongs according to the tenth class and





clearing dispersing separating, are kindred ones. The Gothic *SKAID* to separate if the relationship is certain, has a stiffened Guna so that *ai* appears to belong to the root. According to § 87 however the Gothic form should be *SKAIT* and the Old High German *SKAIZ* for *SKEID* विद्<sup>2</sup> *vid* to know Zend *𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬀* *vid* *IA* Gothic *VID* Old High German, *IZ* in the Latin *VID* and in *εἶδω* I see the seeing is regarded as something which makes to know and the conjugation of *video* is causal according to p 121 G Ed. Thus also another root signifying to know namely *𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀* *budh* has in Zend gained the meaning to see \* According to the tenth class and with the prep *ni* *VID* in Zend signifies to summon (*𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀* *niraldhayēmi* *in loco* see § 28) In Gothic *III* receives through the prep *in* the meaning 'to adore' (*inveita inait invitum*) दिश<sup>6</sup> *dis* to shew Zend *𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀* *dis*<sup>10</sup> hence *𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀* *fradašayō* thou shewest (Vend S p 123) Greek *ΔΙΚ*, with Guna *δεικνυμι* according to the fifth class Latin *DIC* in *dico* as it were 'to point out,' and *dicis* (*dicis causa*) In Gothic the rule laid down in § 87 requires the form *TIH* and this root combined with *ga* signifies to announce (*ga teiha ga taih ga taihūm* for *ga tihūm* according to § 82) On the other hand in *taihūs* sign the law for the transposition of letters is violated जीव<sup>1</sup> *jiv* life Lithuanian *gyva* *s* alive *gyvenū* I live, *gyvata* "life" Gothic *QUIA*, nom *quis* alive, Latin *VIV*, as it appears from *QUI* as *bis* from *duis* (Sansk. *द्वि* *duis*) *viginti* from *tuiginti* The Zend has dropped either the vowel or the *v* of this root Hence e.g. *𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀* *nom* *𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀* *living* (V S p 189) and *𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀* *hu jitayō* *bonam vitam habentes* (I e p 222) from *𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀* *hu jiti* From *j* the root would become with Guna *jayami* on which rests the Greek *ζαω* the *j* having

fallen out (§ 14.), but βίος also belongs to this root, and finds a medium of comparison with 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀮, in the Latin *vivo*. Of roots with *u*, रुच्<sup>1</sup> *ruch*, "to shine," and रुद्<sup>2</sup> *rud*, "to weep," may serve as examples, the former, in Zend, is रुध्<sup>3</sup> *raóh*, (§§ 28 32), and follows the tenth class, e.g. रुध्<sup>3</sup> *raochayéiti*, "splendet"

[G Ed p 129] *raochayéiti*, "splendet" In Latin correspond *LUC*, *luc-s*, *luceo* (§. 20.) and *RUD*. the Greek has, in both roots, replaced the *r* by *l*, and presents, for comparison, ΛΥΚ (ἀμφιλύκη, λυκόφως) and ΛΥΖ, to the former, λύχνος, λυχ-νέω, &c., has the same relation that, in Zend, 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀮 *tafnu-s*, "burning," has to the root 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀮 *tap* (§ 40) We must assign λευκός also, with Guna, to the root ΛΥΚ. The Gothic gives *LUH* for *LUK*, according to §. 87, whence, with the original, or with weakened Guna (§§ 26, 27.), spring forms like *lauhmóni*, "lightning," *lauhatyan*, "to lighten," *luhath*, "light." Without Guna, and preserving the old smooth letter, stands *lukarn* (theme, *lukarna*, neut), "lamp," rather isolated. A root corresponding to रुद् *rud* is wanting in Gothic, but the Old High German has for it, quite regularly according to § 87, *RUZ*, "to weep" (*riuzu*, *rôz* for *rauz*, according to § 80, *ruzumês*) भूष्<sup>1</sup> *bhúsh*, "to adorn," is perhaps contained in the Latin *or-no*, with loss of the initial letter, as *amo* in relation to कामयामि *kāmayāmi*, "I love" With regard to the *r* for *sh*, advert to the relation of *uro* to उश् *ush*, "to burn," सेव<sup>1</sup> *sev*, "to honour," मेध् *médh*, "to think" (p) The latter cannot hitherto be quoted as a verb it springs, however, from मेधस् *médhas* and मेधा *médhā*, "understanding," unless it should be preferred to assume for these words a root *mudh*, which, however, the Grammarians do not exhibit. The Gothic has, for comparison, *MIT*, whence *mitó*, "I think" the Greek furnishes an analogous word to *sév*, viz ΣΕΒ, σέβω (§ 4)

110 From the monosyllabic roots proceed nouns, substantive and adjective, by the annexation of syllables,

which we should not without examination regard as not, *per se* significative and as it were supernatural mystic beings to a passive belief in whose undiscoverable nature we are not willing to surrender ourselves. It is more natural to suppose that they have or had meaning and that the organism of language connects that which has a meaning with what is likewise significative. Why should not language denote necessary ideas by accessory words appended to the root? Language which possesses both sense and body infuses sense and imparts form to every word. The object of nouns is to represent [C. Ed. p. 130] persons or things to which that which the abstract root expresses adheres and hence it is most natural to look for pronouns in the elements used in the formation of words as the bearers of qualities, actions and conditions which the root expresses in *abstracto*. There appears too, in reality, as we shall develop in the chapter on the pronouns a complete identity between the most important elements in the formation of words and some pronominal bases which are declined even in an isolated state. But it is not surprising that several of the elements of verbal formation in the class of independent words should not admit of more certain explanation for these suffixes have their origin in the most obscure and early epoch of language and subsequently they have themselves lost all consciousness as to whence they have been taken on which account the appended suffix does not always keep equal pace with the alterations which in the course of time occur in the corresponding isolated word or it has been altered while the other remains unchanged. Still in individual cases we may remark the admirable exactitude with which the appended grammatical syllables have maintained them

\* I direct attention preliminarily to my treatise 'On the Influence of Pronouns in the Formation of Words' (Berlin by F. Dümmler)

selves through thousands of years in an unaltered form, I say, we may remark this from the perfect accordance which exists between various individuals of the Sanskrit family of languages, although these languages have been removed, as it were, from each other's eyes since time immemorial, and every sister dialect has, since that removal, been left to its own fate and experience.

111. There are also pure radical words, i. e. those of which the theme, without suffix of derivation or personality, repre-

G Ed p 131 ] sents the naked root, which are then united in declension with the syllables which denote the relations of case. Except at the end of compounds, such radical words are, in Sanskrit, few in number, and are all feminine abstracts, as, भ्री *bhrī*, "fear," युध् *yudh*, "contest," मुद् *mud*, "joy." In Greek and Latin the pure root is the most rare form of the word, but it does not always appear as an abstract substantive. As, for instance, *e g* φλογ (φλόκ-ς), ὄπ (ὄπ-ς). νίφ (νίπ-ς), leg (lec-ς), παc (pac-ς), δuc (duc-ς), πελ-lic (pel-lec-ς). In German, commencing even with the Gothic, no pure radical words exist, although, by reason of the abbreviation of the base of the word in the singular, many words have assumed that appearance, for from the abbreviation of these verbal bases, which has been constantly extending during the lapse of time, it is precisely the most modern dialects which appear to exhibit the greatest number of naked roots as nouns. (cf. §. 116.) Naked roots seem most generally used at the end of compounds, on account of the clogging of the preceding part of the word. According to this principle, in Sanskrit, every root can, in this position, designate the agent by itself, as, *e g*. धर्मिद् *dharma-vid*, "duty-knowing." In Latin, the use of these compounds is as frequent as in Sanskrit, only that, according to § 6., a radical *a* is weakened to *i* or *e*, thus, *carni-fic* (*fec-s*), *tubi-cin* (*cen*). An example in Greek is χερυβ (for -νιπ from νιπ-τω) Sanskrit roots which end with short vowels,

as *सिज्* "to conquer" are in compounds of this kind supported by the addition of a *t* which so much the more appears to be a simple phonetic affix without signification that these weakly-constructed roots appear to support themselves on an auxiliary *t* before the gerundinal suffix *ya* also. Thus e.g. *सर्गसिज्* *sarga-jit* "conquering the heaven" *सर्गसिज्या* *u-jit-ya*, "by conquering". In Latin I find [G Ed p 13-] interesting analogies to these formations in *IT* and *STIT* from the roots *I* and *STA* the latter weakened to *STI* according to § 6. Thus *com-it* (*com-es*) "goer with" *equ-it* (*equ-er*) "goer on horseback", *al-it* (*al-es*) "goer with wings" *super-stit* (*stes*) "standing by". The German has in this way supported throughout with a *t* several roots terminating with a vowel and hence given to this letter the character of radicalism as above mentioned (p 123 G Ed) in *MAT* from *मातृ* "to measure".



## FORMATION OF CASES

112.- The Indian Grammarians take up the declinable word in its primary form, *i.e.* in its state when destitute of all case-termination; and this bare form of the word is given also in dictionaries. In this we follow their example, and where we give Sanscrit and Zend nouns, they stand, unless it is otherwise specified, or the sign of case is separated from the base, in their primary form. The Indian Grammarians, however, did not arrive at their primary forms by the method of independent analysis, as it were by an anatomical dissection or chemical decomposition of the body of language, but were guided by the practical use of the language itself, which, at the beginning of compounds and the art of composition is, in Sanscrit, just as necessary as that of conjugation or declension requires the pure primary form, naturally with reservation of the slight changes of the adjoining limits of sound, rendered necessary at times by the laws of euphony. As the primary form at the beginning of compounds can represent every relation of case, it is, as it were, the case general, or the most general of cases, which, in the unlimited use of compounds, occurs more frequently than any other. Nevertheless, the Sanskrit language does not everywhere remain true to the strict and logical principle usually

[G Ed p 134] followed in composition, and as if to vex the Grammarians, and put their logic to the test, it places as the first member of the compounds in the pronouns of the first and second person the ablative plural, and in those of the third person the nom and acc sing of the neuter, instead of the true primary form. The Indian Grammarians, then, in

this point have applied to the cases furnished to them by the language and take the augmented *asmā* or *asmad* from us *yushmā* or *yushmad* from you as the starting point in the declension or as the primary form although in both pronominal forms only *ā* and *yū* belong to the base which however does not extend to the singular. That however in spite of this error the Indian Grammarians understand how to decline the pronouns and that they are not deficient in external rules for this purpose is a matter of course. That the interrogative in its declension resembles bases in *a* can not escape any one who holds the neuter *kim* for the original indeclinable form of the word. Panini settles the matter here with a very laconic rule when he says (edit Cole p 969) *किम् क kimah kah i e ka\** is substituted for *kim*. If this strange method were to be followed in Latin and the neuter *quid* in like manner regarded as the theme then in order to get at the dative *cu* (after the analogy of *fructui*) one would have to say *quidis cus* or '*quidi cus*'. In another place (p 825) Panini forms from *idam* this (which in like manner has the honour of passing for a base) and *kim* what? a copulative compound, and by *इदं किम् idankimōr iskī* the Grammarian teaches that the putative bases in [G Ed p 130] the formations under discussion substitute for themselves the forms *i* and *ki*.

113 The Sanskrit and the languages akin to it, which in this respect have still kept upon the old footing distinguish, besides the two natural genders another—the neuter which the Indian Grammarians call *Khvā i e cu* such which appears to be a peculiarity of the San

\* He forms namely from *kim* regarded as a base *kim as*, which in reality does not occur, and which has for the sake of euphony here become *kimah*.



skrit, or most perfect family of languages. According to its original intention this gender had to represent inanimate nature, but it has not everywhere confined itself to these old limits. the language imparts life to what is inanimate, and, on the other hand, (according to the view then taken,) impairs the personality of what is by nature animate. The feminine in Sanskrit, both in the base and in the case-terminations, loves a luxurious fullness of form, and where it is distinguished from the other genders in the base or in the termination, it marks this distinction by broader, and more sonant vowels. The neuter, on the other hand, prefers the greatest conciseness, but distinguishes itself from the masculine, not in the base, but only, in the most conspicuous cases, in the nominative and its perfect counterpart the accusative, in the vocative also, when this is the same as the nominative.

114 Number, in Sanskrit and its sister languages, is distinguished, not by a particular affix denoting the number, but by the selection or modification of the case-syllable, so that, with the case-suffix, the number is at once known, *e g bhyam, bhyām, and bhyas* are cognate syllables, and, among other relations, express that of the dative, the first in the singular (only in the pronoun of the 2d person, तुभ्यं *tubhyam*, "to thee"), the second in the dual, the third in the plural. The dual, like the neuter, in course of time is the first to be lost with the weakening of the vitality [G. Ed p 136] of the view taken by the senses, or is more and more straitened in its use, and then replaced by the abstract plural expressive of infinite number. The Sanskrit possesses the dual most fully, both in the noun and in the verb, and employs it everywhere where its use could be expected. In the Zend, which otherwise approximates so closely to the Sanskrit, it is found very rarely in the verb, more frequently in the noun. The Pali has only as much left of it as the Latin, viz a remnant of it in two words, which signify "two"

and both in the Prakrit it is entirely wanting. Of the German languages only the eldest dialect the Gothic possesses it but merely in the verb while on the contrary in the Hebrew (speaking here of the Semitic languages) it is retained only in the noun in disadvantageous contrast with the Arabic which in many other respects also is a more perfect language and which maintains the dual in equal fulness in the verb also while in the Syriac it has been almost entirely lost in the noun as well as in the verb \*

11. The case terminations express the reciprocal relations of nouns : *e* the relations of the persons spoken of to one another which principally and originally referred only to space, but from space were extended also to time and cause. According to their origin they are at least for the most part pronouns, as will be more clearly developed hereafter. Whence could the exponents of the relations of space which have grown up with the primary words into a whole have better been taken than from those words which express personality, with their inherent secondary idea of room of that which is nearer or more distant of that which is on this or that side? [G Ed p 137]

As also in verbs the personal terminations : *e* the pronominal suffixes—although in the course of time they are no longer recognised and felt to be that which by their demonstrable origin they imply and are—are replaced or if we may use the expression commented on by the isolated pronouns prefixed to the verb so in the more sunken insensible state of the language the spiritually dead case terminations are in their signification of space replaced supported or ex-

\* Regarding the character the natural foundation and the finer gradations in the use of the dual and its diffusion into the different provinces of language we possess a talented inquiry by W von Humboldt in the Transactions of the Academy for the year 1827, and some which have been published by Dümmler

plained by prepositions, and in their personal signification by the article

116. Before we describe the formation of cases in the order in which the Sanskrit Grammarians dispose them, it appears desirable to give the different final sounds of the nominal bases with which the case-suffixes unite themselves, as well as to point out the mode in which the cognate languages are in this respect related to one another. The three primary vowels (*a, i, u*) occur in Sanskrit, both short and long, at the end of nominal bases, thus, अ *a*, इ *i*, उ *u* आ *ā*, ई *ī*, ऊ *ū*. To the short *a*, always masculine or neuter, never feminine, *a*, corresponds in Zend and Lithuanian, and also in German, where, however, even in the Gothic (in Grimm's first strong declension), especially in substantives, it is only sparingly retained. In more modern dialects it is commonly supplanted by a more recent *u* or *e*. In Greek, the corresponding termination is the *o* of the second declension (e.g. in λόγος) and *o* was also the termination of the Latin noun in ancient times, but in the classic period, although sometimes retained, it was commonly changed to *u* in the nom and accus sing (of the second declension). An old *a*, however, is still left in *cola, gena, cidā*, at the end of compounds, where, however, from the want of other analogies, it is used in declension similarly to the feminine

[G Ed. p 138] originally long *a*, on which account the nominative is written, not *colas, genas, cidas*, but *cola, &c*. The Grecian masculines of the first declension in *ā-s*, with the *η-s* which has proceeded therefrom, must likewise, according to their origin, be compared with the Sanskrit masculine short *a*, to which, in regard of quality and preservation of the nominative sign, they have remained faithful, while the *o* of the second declension has preserved its old original brevity. Their identity with bases in *o* is excellently shewn by the genitive in *ov*, which does not at all

suit  $\alpha$  theme in  $\alpha$  or  $\eta$ , and further from such compounds as  $\muυροπαλης παιδοτριβης$  in which the vowel that has been added to the roots  $\Pi\Omega\Lambda$  and  $TPIB$  supplies the place of the Sanskrit  $a$  in similar compounds for which in Greek  $o$  usually stands

117 To the short  $i$  which occurs in the three genders the same vowel corresponds in the cognate languages. In German it is to be looked for in Grimm's fourth strong declension which I shall make the second where however from the destructive alterations of time it becomes nearly as hard as the  $a$  of the first declension. In Latin  $i$  is interchanged with  $e$  hence *facile* for *facili mare* for *marī*. Sanskrit  $\text{पथि}$   $i\bar{d}ri$  water. In Greek before vowels the  $i$  is generally weakened to the unorganic  $e$ . The short  $u$  also shows itself in Sanskrit in the three genders as in Greek  $υ$  and  $u$  in Gothic where it distinguishes itself from the  $a$  and  $i$  in that it is retained as well before the  $s$  of the nominative as in the uninflected accusative. In Latin the corresponding letter is the  $u$  of the fourth declension.

118 The long vowels ( $\bar{a}$   $\bar{i}$   $\bar{u}$ ) belong in Sanskrit principally to the feminine (see § 113) are never found in the neuter and occur in the masculine very rarely. In Zend the long final  $a$  has generally been shortened in polysyllabic words as it has in Gothic in which bases [G Ed p 139] in  $\bar{o}$  correspond (§ 69) to the Sanskrit feminine bases in  $\bar{a}$  and the  $\bar{o}$  in the uninflected nom and neus sing is shortened to  $a$  with the exception of the monosyllabic forms  $s\bar{o}$  she 'thus Sanskrit  $\text{सा}$   $s\bar{a}$  Zend  $h\bar{a}$   $h\bar{o}$  which? Sanskrit and Zend  $l\bar{a}$ . The Latin also in the uninflected nom and voc has shortened the old feminine long  $a$  but the Lithuanian has in the nom maintained the original length. In Greek the Doric  $a$  approaches most nearly to the Sanskrit feminine  $\text{सा}$   $\bar{a}$  which the common dialect has sometimes preserved sometimes shortened sometimes transformed into  $\eta$ .

119. The long *ī* appears, in Sanskrit, most frequently as a characteristic addition in the formation of feminine bases, thus, the feminine base महती *mahatī* (*magna*) springs from महत् *mahat*. The same holds good in Zend. Moreover, the feminine character *ī* has been preserved most strictly in Lithuanian, where, for example, in the part pres. and fut an *i* is added to the old participial suffix *ant*, and *ésant-i*, "the existing," *bú-sent-i*, "that that shall be," correspond to the Sanskrit सती *sat-ī* (for *asati* or *asanti*), भवन्ति *bhav-i-shyanti*. In Greek and Latin this feminine long *i* has become incapable of declension, and where it has still left traces, there a later unorganic affix has become the bearer of the case-terminations. This affix is, in Greek, either  $\alpha$  or  $\delta$ , in Latin, *e*. Thus, ἡδεῖα corresponds to the Sanskrit सुहृद् *suādu-ī*, from स्वादु *suādu*, "sweet", -τρια, -τριδ, *e g* ὀρχήστρια, ληστρίς, ληστριδ-ος, to the Sanskrit तृति *ti-ī*, *e g* जननी *janitrī*, "genitress," to which the Latin *genitricis*, *genitricis*, corresponds, while in the Greek γενέτειρα, and similar formations, the old feminine *i* is forced back a syllable. This

[G Ed p 140] analogy is followed by μέλαινα, τάλαινα, τέρεινα, and substantive derivations, as τέκταινα, Λάκαινα. In θεράπεινα, λέαινα, the base of the primitive is, as in the nom masc, shortened by a  $\tau$ . In θέαινα, λύκαινα, it is to be assumed that the proper primitive in  $\nu$  or  $\nu\tau$  has been lost, or that these are formations of a different kind, and correspond to the rather isolated word in Sanskrit इन्द्राणी *Indrānī*, as the wife of Indra, as derived from इन्द्र *Indra*, is termed. The cases where the feminine *i* is solely represented by  $\alpha$  are essentially limited to feminine derivatives from forms in  $\nu\tau$ , where  $\tau$  passes into  $\sigma$  the preceding  $\nu$ , however, is replaced by  $\upsilon$  or  $\iota$ , or the mere lengthening of the preceding vowel, or it is assimilated to the  $\sigma$

hence,  $\omicron\sigma-\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon\sigma-\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon\sigma\sigma-\alpha$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}\sigma-\alpha$ ,  $\bar{\upsilon}\sigma-\alpha$

for  $\omicron\nu\tau-\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon\nu\tau-\alpha$ ,  $\epsilon\nu\tau-\alpha$ ,  $\alpha\nu\tau-\alpha$ ,  $\upsilon\nu\tau-\alpha$

\* In Doric subsequent and original  $\alpha\iota\sigma-\alpha$

To this analogy belong moreover, the feminine substantives like *θαλασσα βασιλισσα μελισσα* which J Grimm (II 328) very correctly in my opinion compares with forms like *χαρι εσσα μελιτο εσσα* and explains the double *σ* by gemination or assimilation. The feminine formations by *α* simple instead of the original *ι* are most corrupt and relatively the most recent and herein the Greek is not supported by any of the cognate languages. The Latin its twin sister which otherwise runs parallel to it leaves in the part pres and other adjective bases terminating with *α* consonant the feminine undistinguished from the masculine through all the cases since it has no longer the power of declining the old *ι*.

120 The German too can no longer fully decline the old feminine *ι* and the Gothic by a foreign affix introduces it into the *δ* declension but in the singular of substantives shortens the syllable *υδ* in the [G Ed p 141] uninflected nominative and vocative to *ι* in the adjective to *υα*. More commonly however the old bases in *ι* are introduced by the frequently employed affix of an *n* into the so-called weak declension and as *ι* in Gothic is denoted by *ei* so to the Sanskrit feminine participial bases in *अन्ति anti* and to the fem comparative bases in *ईयसी iyasi* correspond the forms *ndein ixem* regarding the nominative of which refer to § 142.

121 The long *u* (*ū*) appears in Sanskrit rather seldom at the end of primary forms and is for the most part feminine. The words most in use are *वधू vadhu* a wife *भू bhū* earth *श्वश्रू shvasru* mother in law (*socrus*) *भूभ्रू bhūbhru* eyebrow. To the latter corresponds *οφρυς* likewise with the long *υ* the declension of which however is not different from that of the short *υ* while in Sanskrit the long *u* is distinguished from the short feminine *u* in the same way as *ई* from *इ*. But few monosyllabic primary forms end in Sanskrit with diphthongs not any at all with *ए e* with *ऐ ai* (from *a + i* see § 2) only *ईरि iri* masc thing 'riches' in

the nom irregularly रास् *īā-s* for री *īā-s*. In this is recognised the Latin *re-s*. Still I do not believe that Latin bases in *ē* should therefore be looked upon as corresponding to the Sanskrit रे *ā*, for, in the first place, the Latin *ē* corresponds elsewhere to the Sanskrit ए *ē* (from *ā + i*), never to *ā*; secondly, the connection of the *ē* of the fifth declension with the originally long *a* of the first is not to be mistaken (to which it bears the same relation that the Ionic *η* does to the Doric *ᾱ*), for many words with the same meaning belong to the A and E declension; and, for example, a suffix which is employed for the formation of abstracts from adjectives is sounded as well *tiē* as *tia* (*planitie-s*,

[G Ed p 142] *planitia, canitie-s, cantia*), and *iē-s*, and *ia*, in the formation of primitive and derivative words like *effigie-s, effigia, pauperie-s, pauperia* are clearly one and the same suffix, identical with the Sanskrit णि *ṇi*, which is used for the same purpose, and the Greek *ία*, Ionic *ίη*. Let us now consider the objections which are opposed to the original identity of the feminine *ē* and *a*. The most weighty is the *s* in the nom. sing and pl. *ē-s, ē-s* for *ē, ei*, as *musa, musæ (musæ)*, κεφαλῇ, κεφαλαί. As regards the *s* in the singular, it is, if the identity with the first declension be authentic, very remarkable, and forms like *species, canities*, seem to be true lingual patriarchs for the Sanskrit, like the Zend, Greek, Gothic, Lithuanian, exhibits the absence of the nominative sign in the corresponding feminine bases in *a*. I have, however, never considered as original the abandonment of the nominative sign, and the complete equalization with the primary form in सुता *sutā*, "daughter," and similar words, although it has appeared to me as losing itself very deeply in far-distant ages. The Latin, however, in some other points of Grammar, shews greater antiquity than the Sanskrit and Greek, as, for example (to confine the present instance to the nominative case), participial nominatives, like *amans, legens*, are better and

older forms than the Sanskrit and Greek like तुदन् *tudan* λεγων *tiθεις* because they have preserved the nominative *s* together with the nasal and therein stand on the same footing with Zend forms like *avans* being I cannot therefore find in the retention of the nominative sign in the fifth declension any decisive argument against its original identity with the first We will treat hereafter of the *s* of the nominative plural In the genitive singular the common form *ei* answers to *deae* (*deai*) the more rare however and better in *es* to *familias* Schneider searches but fortunately without [G Ed p 143] success, for genitives like *die-is* we require them as little perhaps as *a familia is* Let *dies* be written with Greek letters *διης* and then perhaps a *die is* will be as little required as a *δικη os* Although a few bases of the third declension by rejecting a consonant or an entire syllable have passed into the fifth declension we will not therefore infer that all bases in *e* have arisen from such an abbreviation If *QUIET* after rejecting the *t* could be declined according to the fifth declension then must there necessarily have formerly been a fifth *ie* there must have been bases in *e* otherwise from *QUIET* could only have come *QUII* (*quies quus* like *cædes*) *ie* in spite of the rejection of the *t* it must have continued in the third declension The connection between *re s* and the above-mentioned Sanskrit *रैर्दा* is in my opinion to be arrived at through the irregular nominative *रास् र्दा s* and according to this *re s* would be supported on an old *a* it answers to *रास् ra s* as *रैर्* *bus* to *राभ्यस् ra bhyas* and as in Greek *γη* to the Sanskrit *गम् gum* *terram* which in the remaining cases has *गे go* for its base In Lithuanian there are feminine primary forms in *e* (Ruhig's third declension) which resemble the Greek *η* in the suppression of the singular nominative sign but in the nominative plural in *es* approach more closely the Latin in *e*



122. Primary forms in *द्यो* *dyô* are rare in Sanskrit the only ones known to me are *द्यो* *dyô*, "heaven," and *गो* *gô* the former is feminine, and properly proceeds from *दि* *di* (a radical word from *दि* *div*, "to shine") by the vocalization of the *व* *v*, after which the vowel *इ* *i* becomes its semi-vowel *य* *y*. In the accusative the *ô* bases change this diphthong into *â*. To the *â* thus obtained in *द्याम्* *dyâ-m*,

[G Ed. p 144] *गाम्* *gâ-m*, corresponds the Latin *e* of *dic-m*, the Greek *η*, Doric *α*, of *γῆ-ν*, *γᾱ-ν* the Latin *e*, however, is rendered short by the influence of the final *m* the original language requires *diē-m*. In Sanskrit, also, from *दि* *div*, "to shine," are derived appellations of day, as on the other side, in Latin, those for the heaven- *diuum*, *sub diuo*, *sub dio*

*viz* *दिवा* *divâ*, as an adverb, "by day," and used as a primary form at the beginning of compounds, and also *दिवस* *divasa*, masc, and *द्यु* *dyu*, neuter (a contraction from *div*), which latter signifies both "day" and "heaven." To *द्यु* *dyu* answers, after rejecting the *d* (as *viginti* for *dviginti*), the Latin *Ju* of *Ju-piter*, "heavens-lord or father" the oblique cases *Jov-is*, *Jov-i*, *Jov-em* answer better to the broader theme *द्यो* *dyô*, whence the dative *द्यवे* *dyav-ê*, and the locat *द्यवि* *dyav-i*. The *Djovis*, moreover, furnished by Varro, deserves mention, as that which keeps most faithfully to the ancient form. The Grecian *Ζεύς* signifies, therefore, in accordance with its origin primarily, "heaven" I form its relation to *द्यो* *dyô* thus, that after dropping the *द* *d* the following semi-vowel *य* *y* became *ζ* (§ 19). The oblique cases, on the contrary (*Διός*, *Διί*, &c), belong to the Sanskrit *द्यु* *dyu*, and must originally have had a digamma, proceeding by the natural law of sound from *u*, after which change the semi-vowel *y* must have become a vowel. *Διός* has the same relation to *Διφός*, that, in Latin, *sub dio* has to *sub divo*.

123 Let us now consider the second of the abovementioned primary forms in *ô*, *viz* *गो* *gô*. It has several

meanings but the most common are bull,' as masculine and cow and earth' as feminine Both significations have in Zend, as in Greek divided themselves into two forms The Greek has preserved for the meaning 'earth' the old guttural With regard to the vowel γῆ γᾱ follows the example of the Indian accusative where as has been already remarked गम् *gam* (गम्) stands for *gā-m* [G Ed p 145] or *gav am* For the meaning ox the Greek has preserved the old diphthong—for for ओ  $\delta = a \times u$  may very well be expected according to § 4, *ou*)—but has exchanged the guttural medials for labials as p 122 G Ed βίβημι for गवमि *jagumi* The base BOY before vowels must originally have become BOF thus in the dative βοφι would answer to the Sanskrit locat गवि *gavi* and the Latin dative *bovi* but in the present state of the language the middle digamma between two vowels has always been dropped, and there is not as with the initial digamma the medium of metre for replacing it in the oldest writings Only theory and comparative grammar can decide here The Latin has, in the word *bovis* changed the vowels ( $a + u$ )—(which were originally of different kinds but have been united into a diphthong)—into a homogeneous mass (cf § 4) the nature of whose contraction however discloses itself before vowel inflexions since the *u* half of *BŌ* becomes *v* and the short *a* is resolved into the form of a short *o* thus *bovis* answers to the Sanskrit locat गवि *gavi* The Zend for the meaning earth has changed the guttural of the word under discussion into *z* and gives in the nominative 𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *zāu* for 𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *zās* (§ 56) in the accusative 𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *zānu* (§ 61) I am not able to adduce other cases For the meaning ox the guttural has remained in Zend and the nominative is then 𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *gāu* or 𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *gāu*

124 I know only two words in Sanskrit which terminate in औ *au*—नी *nāu* ship and ग्लौ *glāu* moon the former has navigated very far on the ocean of our wide province of

language, without, however, in Sanskrit, having arrived at a secure etymological haven. I believe नौ *nāu* to be an abbreviation of *snau* (cf. स्नौ, स्नौ, *ruo*, with स्नु *sru*, p. 125 G. ed.),

[G Ed p 146] and that it therefore proceeds from the root स्नान् *snā*, "to bathe," which originally, perhaps, may also have meant "to swim," and with which स्नौ, स्नौ, *na-to*, appear to be connected. नौ *nāu* would consequently be a radical word, and in regard to the vowel would stand for *nā*, according to the analogy of ददौ *dadāu* (*dedi*, *dedit*) for *dadā*, from *dadā-a*. As *a*, according to § 6, is a grave vowel, the Greek cannot represent the Sanskrit Vriddhi-diphthong औ *āu* better than by *au*, while ओ *o* (from short *a+u*) is commonly represented by *cu* or *ou*. Hence नौस् *nāu-s* and स्नौस् *snāu-s* correspond as exactly as possible, the *u* of *NAY*, however, like that of *BOY*, has maintained itself only before consonants, and the digamma, which replaces it, is lost before vowel inflexions, *νῆ-ες*, *νᾶ-ες*, are from *νᾶF-ες* (Sansk. स्नौस् *nāu-as*), as *βό-ες* from *βόF-ες*. The Latin has given this word a foreign addition, and uses *navi-s*, *navi-bus*, for *nau-s*, *nau-bus*. As the semi-vowel *v* is easily hardened to a guttural (§. 19), we have here also, for *nau*, *nāu-am*, a sister form in our *Nachen*, Old High German *naccho*, "ship," gen. dat *nacchin*.

125. We pass over to the consonants. of these, *n*, *t*, *s*, and *r* appear in Sanskrit most frequently at the end of primary forms, all other consonants occur only in radical words, which are rare, and in some nominal bases of uncertain origin. We consider next the more rare or radical consonants. Of gutturals (*k*, *kh*, *g*, *gh*) we find none at

Thus in German an *z* has been added to the above-mentioned गो *gô*, which, however, according to § 117, is suppressed, together with the case sign in Old High German, hence *chuo*, "cow," gen. *chuor*, where the *z* does not belong to the case designation, but to the here uninflected base.

the end of the nominal bases most in use in Greek and Latin on the contrary they are of frequent occurrence, *c* is in Latin both radical and derivative [G Ed p 147] *g* only radical—*DUC IORAC EDAC LEG* In Greek, *κ*, *χ*, and *γ* are only radical or occur in words of unknown origin as *κΡΗΚ* *KOPAK* *ONYX* (Sanskrit *nakha*), *κΑΟΓ* Of the palatals *ch* and *j* in Sanskrit occur most frequently in *वाच* *vāch* speech voice (*IOC ON*) *राज* *rāj* king the latter only at the end of compounds *आसज* *asry* blood' (*sanguis*) in Zend we have *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎* *dry* *f* as name of an evil demon probably from the Sanskrit root *द्रुह* *druh* to hate Of the two classes of the *T* sound the first or lingual (*ṛ t &c*) is not used at the end of nominal bases and therefore the second dental or proper *T* class is so much the more frequently employed Still *ṛ d ṣ dh* occur only in radical words and therefore seldom *पथ* *th* perhaps only in *पथ* *path* as the secondary theme of *पथिन्* *pathin* way nom *पथिन्* *panthās* from *पथन्* *panthas* which I think I again recognise in the Latin *PONT* *pons* Other examples are *अद* *ad* eating at the end of compounds and *युध* *yudh* *f* strife The letter *त* *t* is so much the more common that several of the most frequently employed suffixes end with it as that of the part pres in *अत* *at* or *अन्त* *ant* Greek and Latin *nt* The Greek besides *τ*, exhibits also *δ* and *θ* at the end of primary forms which are not radical still *ΚΟΡΥΟ* and *ΟΡΝΙΟ* appear to me to be properly compounds and to contain the roots *ΟΗ* *OE* (the vowel being dropped) as their last member and according to this *ΚΟΡΥΟ* would properly mean what is placed on the head so in Sanskrit *शरद्* *sarad* autumn rainy season which Grammarians explain by a suffix *ad* in my opinion means nothing but water giving and contains the root *दा* *dā* to give with *d* suppressed *ΟΙΝΙΟ* finds in Greek itself no etymology the Sanskrit offers for its explanation *आरु* *arū* (according to the pronunciation of Bengal *orū*), 'wood', and if *ορν* is con [G Ld p 148]

nected therewith, we may refer to  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ , "to run," in respect to the  $\theta$  "bird" therefore would derive its name from its going in the wood, while in Sanskrit, from its passage through the air, it is called, among other names,  $\text{वह्नि}$  *viha-ga*. Regarding the later origin of the  $\delta$  in feminine bases in  $\iota\delta$ , an account is given in §. 119 ; that is to say, patronymics in  $\iota\delta$  may be compared with Sanskrit ones in  $\acute{i}$ , e g भैरवी *bhāmī*, "the daughter of Bhîma. Probably, too, the  $\delta$  in feminine patronymics in  $\alpha\delta$  is a later addition, they spring, like those in  $\iota\delta$ , not from their masculines, but directly from the primary word of the masculine, and, in my opinion, stand in sisterly, not in filial connection with them. In Latin, *d* appears as a more modern affix in the base *PECUD*, which the Sanskrit, Zend, and Gothic terminate with *u* (Sans-Zend, *paśu*, Goth *faihu*) In Gothic, primary forms with a final *T*-sound are chiefly limited to the part pres, where the old *t* appears changed into *d*, which remains without extraneous addition there only, however, where the form stands substantively, otherwise, with the exception of the nominative, it is conducted by the affix *an* into a more current province of declension. The more modern German dialects under no circumstances leave the old *T*-sound without a foreign addition commixed with the base. In Lithuanian the participial suffix *ant*, in regard of the nom sing. *ans* for *ants*, rests exactly upon the Latin and Zend step, which extends beyond the Sanskrit, but in most of the remaining cases the Lithuanian cannot decline any more consonants, i.e. cannot unite them with pure case terminations, but transports them always, by a more modern affix, into a vowel-declension, and, indeed, to the participial suffix *ant* is added the [G Ed p 149] syllable *ia*, by the influence of which the *t* experiences the euphonic transformation into *ch* (= *tsch*\*) The nasal of this dental *T*-class, viz. the

This sound is expressed by *cs*, as in Mielcke's edition of Rulig's Grammar

proper *n* belongs to those consonants which occur most frequently at the end of nominal bases. In the German all the words of Grimm's weak declension like the Sanskrit and the masculine and feminine in Latin reject in the nominative the *n* of the base and thereby have a vowel termination. The Lithuanian presents the same appearance in the nominative but in most of the oblique cases adds to a base in *en* sometimes *ia* sometimes a simple *ı*.

126 Primary forms with a final labial including the nasal (*m*) of this organ appear in Sanskrit only in naked roots as the last member of compounds and here too but seldom. In isolated use however we have अप् *ap* (probably from the root अप् *ap* to take in to comprehend) water which is used only in the plural in Zend however in the singular also\*. In Greek and Latin also bases in *p b φ* are either evidently radical or of unknown origin with probably radical letters at the end or in Latin they have suppressed in the nominative a vowel belonging to the base and so as in [G Ed p 150] German the first and fourth strong declensions according to Grimm have only the appearance of a base terminating with a consonant. Of this kind is *plebs* from *plebis* to explain which it is not requisite to turn with Voss to the Greek *πληθος* one must keep to the Latin root *PLE*. The derivative *bis* *bes* I explain like *bus* *bundus* *bilis* *bam*

\* The Latin adds an *a* to this old consonantal base and thus arises according to the frequent interchange of *p* with *qu* (cf *quinque* with पञ्च *panchan*) *aqua* on the other hand *amnis* rests on the form *ap* as *somnus* for *sopnus* and *σμς* for *σβως* in analogy with a Sanskrit euphonic law (Gramm Crit r 58). The Sanskrit has from the same root another neuter *अपस्* *apas* in which we recognise the Latin *æquor* which therefore would not proceed from *æquus* but is transferred from the waves or the mirror of the sea, to other things of a similar nature. In Greek *αφρς* appears to belong to the same origin.

*bo* (*amabam*, *-bo*), as from the root *FU*, "to be," which, like *FER*, often changes the *B* in its middle into *F* (§. 18). Without appealing to the cognate languages, it is difficult, in Latin, to distinguish those bases which truly and originally terminate in a consonant from those which only appear to do so, for the declension in *i* has clearly operated on the consonantal declension, and introduced an *i* into different places in which it is impossible it could have stood originally. In the dative and ablative plural, the *i* of forms like *amantibus*, *vocibus*, admits of being explained as a conjunctive vowel, for facilitating the affix, it is, however, in my opinion, more correct to say that the bases *VOX*, *AMANT*, &c., because they could not unite with *bus*, have, in the present state of the Latin language, been lengthened to *VOXI*, *AMANTI*; so that we ought to divide *voci-bus*, *amanti-bus*, just as at § 125. it was said of the Lithuanian, that in most cases it extends its participial bases in *ant* to *anchia* (euphonic for *antia*). This view of forms like *amanti-bus* is proved to be the more probable, in that in the genitive plural also before *um*, as before the *a* of neuters, an *i* frequently finds its place, without its being possible to say that in *amanti-um*, *amanti-a*, the *i* would be necessary to facilitate the annexation of the ending. On the other hand, *juveni-s*, *cani-s*, forming the genitives *canu-m*, *juven-um*, remind us of older bases in *n*; as in Sanskrit श्वन् *śvan*, "a dog" (abbreviated शुन् *śun*), and युवन् *yuvan*, "young" (abbreviated यून् *yūn*), in Greek κύων, abbreviated [G Ed p 151] KYN, really close their theme with *n*. The German resembles the Latin in this point, that for the convenience of declension it has added an *i* to several numerals, whose theme originally terminated with a consonant, thus, in Gothic, from *FIDVŌRI* (Sanskrit चतुर् *chatur*, in the strong cases § 129 चत्वारि *chatvārī*) comes the dative *fidvōri-m*. The themes सप्तन् *saptan*, "seven," नवन् *navan*, "nine," दशन् *daśan*, "ten," by the addition of an *i*,

in Old High German 'mould themselves to *SIBUNI NIUNI ZEHANI* which forms at the same time pass as masculine nominatives as these cases in Old High German have lost the case suffix *s*. The corresponding Gothic nominatives if they occurred would be *sibunei s niunei s taihunei s*. More on this point hereafter.

127 Of the semi vowels (*y r l, v*) I have never found in Sanskrit *य y* and *ल l* at the end of bases and *व v* only in the word *दिव du* before mentioned which contracts itself in several cases to *द्यो dyo* and *द्यु dyu*. On the other hand *र r* occurs very frequently especially in words which are formed by the suffix *तर tar,\** to which in the cognate languages likewise correspond bases in *r*. Moreover *r* in Latin appears frequently as an alteration of an original *s* as in the comparative suffix *ior* (Sanskrit *ईयस iyas*) and further as an abbreviation of *ris* as *l* for *lis* *le* or in the second declension as abbreviated from *rus* as in Gothic, *iaur* man for *uir(a)s* belongs to bases in *a* (§ 116). In Greek *AA* appears as a consonantal base but in contrast with the [G Ed p 10<sup>o</sup>] Sanskrit *सलिल salila* water *ᾱλ s* appears abbreviated exactly in the same manner as *μεγα-ς* from *μεγαλος*.

128 Of the Sanskrit sibilants the two first (*श s* *ष sh*) as also the *ह h* are found only in radical words and therefore seldom. *स s* on the contrary concludes some very common suffixes used in the formation of words as *सस् as* which forms principally neuters e.g. *तेजस tjas* splendour strength from *तिर ty* to sharpen. The Greek appears to be without bases in *Σ* this however proceeds from the following reason that this sibilant between two

\* Bases in *सर ar* in several cases and in the primary form also at the beginning of compounds contract the syllable *सर ar* to *चृ ri* and this *चृ ri* is regarded by the Grammarians as their proper final sound (§ 1)



vowels, especially in the last syllable, is usually rejected, hence, neuters like μένος, γένος (from ΜΕΝΕΣ, ΓΕΝΕΣ, with change of the *c* into *o*), form in the genitive μένκος, γένκος, for μένσος, γένσος. The *ς* of the nominative, however, belongs, as I have already elsewhere remarked, to the base, and not to the case designation, as neuters have no *ς* in the nominative. In the dative plural, however, in the old epic language, the *Σ*, as it did not stand between two vowels, maintained itself, hence τέυχσσι, ὄρεσσι, so likewise in compounds, like σακής-παλος, τελες-φόρος, in which it would be wrong to assume the annexation of a *Σ* to the vowel of the base. In γήρας, γήρα-ος, for γήρασ-ος, after restoring the *Σ* of the base, the form of word answers exactly to the Sanskrit *अयस्य*, "age," although the Indian form is not neuter, but feminine. In Lithuanian, another remarkable remnant of the Sanskrit suffixes terminating with *s* has been preserved, viz. in the partic. perf., in the oblique cases of which *us* corresponds to the Sanskrit *अस्य* (euphonic for *अस्य* *us*) of the weakest cases (§ 130), still, in Lithuanian, on account of the above-noticed incapacity for the declension of the consonants, the old *us* is conducted, as in other similar cases, by the subsequent addition of *ia*, *a* or *i*, partly into the *a*, partly into the [G Ed p 153] *i* declension, and only the nominative and the vocative, which is the same with it, belong, in the singular, to the consonantal declension.

129. The Sanskrit and Zend have eight cases, viz. besides those which exist in Latin, an instrumental and a locative. These two cases exist also in Lithuanian, Ruhg calls the former the instrumental ablative, the latter the local ablative, in Lithuanian, however, the proper ablative which in Sanskrit expresses the relation "whence?" is wanting. With reference to the primary form, which in Sanskrit does not remain the same in all words, or

suffixes used in the formation of words through all the cases a division of the cases into *strong* and *weak* is desirable for this language. The strong cases are the nominative accusative and vocative of the three numbers with exception of the accusative plural which together with all the other cases is weak. Where a double or triple formation of the primary form exists there with surprising regularity the cases which have been designated as strong always exhibit the fullest form of the theme which from a comparison of languages is proved to be the original one while the other cases exhibit a weakened form of it which appears also in the beginning of compounds and hence is represented by the native Grammarians according to § 122 as the proper primary form. The present may serve as an example it forms the strong cases with the suffix *ant* but in the weak cases and in the beginning of compounds rejects *n* which is retained by the cognate European languages as also for the most part by Zend so that चत् *at* is given as the suffix of this participle in preference to चन् *ant*. The root तु *tud* to vex *eg* exhibits in the participle mentioned the form तुन् *ta* *dant* as the strong and original theme (cf. *insident em*) and तुदन् *tudat* as the weak theme hence he masculine is declined

[C. Ld. I. 104]

		STRONG CASES		WEAK CASES	
Singular	Nom Voc	तुन्	<i>tudan</i>		
	Ace	तुदन्	<i>tudantam</i>		
	Instr			तुदन्ता	<i>tudantā</i>
	Dat			तुदन्ते	<i>tudante</i>
	Abl			तुदन्म्	<i>tudatas</i>
	Gen			तुदन्म्	<i>tudatas</i>
	Loc			तुदन्ति	<i>tudati</i>
Dual	Nom Acc Voc	तुदन्तौ	<i>tudantdu</i>		
	Instr Dat Abl			तुदन्तम्	<i>tudantibhyām</i>
	Gen Loc			तुदन्तौ	<i>tudatōr</i>

## STRONG CASES.

## WEAK CASES

Plural . Nom Voc . . तुदन्तस् <i>tudantas</i>	. . . .
Acc	तुदन्तस् <i>tudantas</i>
Instr.	तुदन्भिस् <i>tudadbhīs</i> .
Dat Abl . . .	तुदन्भ्यस् <i>tudadbhyaś</i>
Gen. . . .	तुदन्तम् <i>tudantām</i>
Loc . . .	तुदन्तु <i>tudatsu</i>

130. Where three formations of the primary form pervade the declension of a word or a suffix, the weakest form of the theme there occurs in those weak cases whose terminations begin with a vowel, the middle form before those case-suffixes which commence with a consonant. This rule makes a division of the cases into strong, weaker or middle, and weakest, desirable (See Gramm Crit. i. 185.)

131 In suffixes used in the formation of words, which in Sanskrit separate into different forms, the Zend usually carries the strong form through all the cases, for instance, the part pres. retains the nasal in most of the cases, which in Sanskrit

[G. Ed p 155] proceed from the weakened theme. Words, however, are not wanting which follow the theory of the Sanskrit gradations of form. Thus, the Sanskrit base अन् *śvan*, "hound," which in the weakest cases is contracted to शुन् *śun*, appears in Zend likewise in a double form, and presents the weak genitive *śân-ō* over against the strong nominative and accusative *śpā*, *śpān-ēm*, Sanskrit वा *śvā*, आनम् *śvānam* (§ 50). The base अप, "water," which, in Sanskrit, in the strong cases has a long *ā*, but is not used in the singular, forms in the Zend the strong sing. nom *āfs* (§ 40), accus *āpēm*, on the other hand, *ap-ō*, "of the water," *ap-at*, "from the water," &c

\* This word occurs in the Codex of the V S, edited by Burnouf, very frequently, and mostly with that quantity of the initial *a* which is required by the theory, so that where that is not the case it can only be imputed to an error in writing

In the plural where the 7<sup>nd</sup> very frequently makes the nominative and accusative the same confusion has for this reason crept in and the weak *ሥጋዎች ስጋዎች* *sundō kanes* is found for *ሥጋዎች ስጋዎች* *spāno* in the nominative and on the other hand the strong *ሥጋዎች ስጋዎች* *apō* in the nominative as well as in the accusative \*

132 The Greek in the declension of *κλυῖ* has limited the strong form to the nom and voc sing in [G Ed p 166] some cognate words in *ρ* however in accordance with the Sanskrit it has given the accusative also the strong form in which the Gothic agrees with it Compare *πατήρ πατέρα πατέρ πατρί* with *पिता पितु पित्रम् पितरं पितरं पितरि* (*locat*) and the Gothic *bróðhar* as nom accus and vocat opposed to *bróðirs* of the brother *bróðhr* to the brother with the Sanskrit *भ्राता ब्रह्मद् भ्रात्रम् ब्रह्मतारम् भ्रातृ ब्रह्मतर दative भ्रात्रे locat भ्रात्रि* According to the same principle in bases in *an* in Gothic the *a* in the genitive and dative sing is weakened to *i* (§ 140), while the nominative accus and vocat. retain the original *a*, e g *ahma ahmin s ahmin ahman ahma* from *AIHMAN* "spirit" (§ 140)

133 As regards the mode of combining the final vowels of the primary forms with case suffixes beginning with *n* vowel we must first draw attention to a phenomenon which is almost limited to the Sanskrit and the dialects which

\* I have however found also *ቅዱስ* *apô* in the accusative and am therefore in doubt whether in this word owing to the facile exchange of *u* *a* and *au* *â* the confusion has not originated in mere graphical oversights. Thus V S p 21 we find *ፍጥረትና ሕይወት ቅዱስ ጸዕና ጸዕና ሕይወትና ፍጥረትና ሕይወትና* *apo ranhuus i alustâo ma-da dhutao ashaonis a jêst aquas puras optimas ab Ormu do creatas mundas celebro* and *ቅዱስ ፍጥረትና ሕይወትና* *ispâo apo omnes aquas*. On the other hand in the page following *ሕይወትና ሕይወትና ፍጥረትና ሕይወትና ሕይወትና ሕይወትና ሕይወትና* *imâo apas-cha zemâs cha urardos cha dyêst has aquasque terra que arboresque celebro*

approximate most nearly to it, as Pāli and Prākṛit, through which, to avoid a hiatus, and to maintain pure the vowels of the base and of the termination, a euphonic *n* is introduced. This euphonic expedient cannot, in the extent in which it exists in Sanskrit, belong to the original state of the language, otherwise it would not be almost entirely lost in the cognate European dialects, and even in the Zend. We therefore regard it as a peculiarity of the dialect, which after the period of the division of languages, became the prevailing one in India, and has raised itself to be the universal written language in that country. It is necessary here to remark, that the Vêda language did not use the euphonic *n* so universally as the common Sanskrit, and together with *एन* *ēnā*, *इन* *ind*, *उन* *und*, occur also *अय* *ayā*, *इय* *iyā*, *उय* *uyā*. The euphonic *n* is most frequently employed by the neuter

[G Ed p 157] gender, less so by the masculine, and most rarely by the feminine. The latter limits its use to the plural genitive termination *आम्* *ām*, in which place it is introduced by the Zend also, although not as indispensably requisite. And it is remarkable, that precisely in this place in Old High German, and other Old German dialects, an *n* has been retained before the case-suffix, thus in Old High German, *ahō-n-ō*, "*aquarum*," from the feminine theme *AHŌ* (nom. *aha*). Besides the use of the euphonic *n*, there is further to be remarked, in Sanskrit and Zend, the attachment of Guna to the vowels of the base (§ 26) in certain cases, to which also the Gothic presents analogies

## S I N G U L A R

### NOMINATIVE

134 Bases, of the masculine and feminine genders, ending with a vowel have, in the Sanskrit family of languages, (under the limitation of § 137) *s* as nominative-suffix, which in Zend, after an *a* preceding it, always melts into *u*, and is then contracted with the *a* to *ō* (§ 2), while this in Sanskrit

takes place only before sonant letters (§ 25)\* Examples are given at § 118 I find the origin of this case designation in the pronominal base *sa* he this fem *sa* *śā*, and a convincing proof of this assertion is the fact that the said pronoun does not extend beyond the limits of the nom masc and fem but is replaced in the nom neuter and in the oblique cases of the masculine by *ta* *tā* and feminine *tā* *tā* regarding which more hereafter

135 The Gothic suppresses *a* and *i* before the case suffix *s* except in monosyllabic bases where this suppression is impossible *Hwas* who? *is* he are used but *wulf* *s* 'wolf' *gast* *s* stranger for *wulfa* *s* *gasti* *s* (cf *hosti* *s* according to § 87) In masculine substantive bases in *ja* (*ya*) however the final vowel is retained only weakened to *i* (§ 66) e g *haryi* *s* army If however as is generally the case the final syllable is preceded by a long syllable or by more than one the *yi* (*yi*) is contracted to *ai* (= *i*, § 70) e g *ondai* *s* end *raginai* *s*, counsel for *andyi* *s* *raginyi* *s* This contraction extends also to the genitive which is in like manner denoted by *s* To the Gothic nominatives in *yi* *s* correspond the Lithuanian like *Atpirli toyi* *s* Saviour the *i* of which has likewise arisen from an elder *a*† I deduce this from the majority of the oblique cases, which agree with those of the *a* bases Where, however in Lithuanian a consonant precedes the final syllable *ya* which is the more common case there the *y* is changed into the vowel *ɛ* and the following *i* which had arisen from *a* is suppressed hence *yauniki* *s* young man for *yauniki* *kyi* *s* from *yaunikkya* *s* Hereto correspond in Gothic all adjective bases in *ya*†

E g सुतो मम *sutō mama* 'filius meus' सुतस् तय *sutas taya*, *fi* *lius tuus* (§ 22)

† Through the influence of the *y* in accordance with a Zend law of euphony (§ 42)

Respecting the nom *e g* of Gothic bases in *ya* see p 1309 G Ed Remark

as *mudṛ-s* "the middle" (man), for *midyṛ-s* from *midyā-s*, Sanskrit मध्यस् *madhya-s*. The Zend also, in the *vocalization*\* of the syllable *ya*, presents a remarkable analogy to the Lithuanian and Gothic in contracting the syllable *ya* before a final *ç* *m* regularly to *z* *i*, as also *va* to *z* *û* (§ 42)

136 The High German has, up to our time, preserved the old nominative sign in the changed form of *r*, nevertheless, as early as in the Old High German, in pronouns and adjectives only, with a vowel termination of the base.

[G Ed. p 159] The High German is, however, in this point, superior to the Gothic in fulness, that in its *a* bases to which belong all strong adjectives—it has not suppressed the vowel before the case-sign, but preserved it in the form of *e*, which, in Old High German—as it appears through the influence of the *r* is long, but only in polysyllabic, not in monosyllabic forms. Thus, *e g. plint-ër*, "cæcus," completes the Gothic *blind-s* for *blinda-s*, as to the Gothic *iz-s*, "he," corresponds *iz-r*, Middle and New High German *e-r*. The Old Northern has likewise *r* as the nominative sign, and, in fact, everywhere where, in Gothic, *s* stands. In the other dialects the nominative character is entirely lost.

137. Feminine Sanskrit bases in *ṣṭi d*, and, with very few exceptions, polysyllables in *ṣṭi i*, together with *ṣṭi stī*, "wife," like the corresponding forms of the cognate languages, have lost the old nominative sign (with the exception of the Latin *ē* bases, see §. 121), and give the pure base. The cognate languages do the same, the base having been weakened by the abbreviation of the final vowel. In Gothic, *ô* becomes *a* (§ 69), only *sô*, "this," and *hwô* "which?" remain unshortened, on account of their being monosyllabic, as in Zend *hâ* and *kâ*, while in polysyllabic forms the

\* I have used *vocalization* and *vocalize* to express the change of a semi-vowel to its corresponding vowel.—*Trans*

as *ā* is shortened In Zend *𐬀𐬀* also is shortened even in the monosyllabic *𐬀𐬀𐬀 stri* "wife" see V S p 136 (by Olshausen) p 28 where we read *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 stri cha feminaque* whilst elsewhere the appended *𐬀𐬀 cha* preserves the original length of the vowel Here, too the Zend nominatives in *𐬀𐬀* deserve to be mentioned which seem very similar to the Greek in *η*, as *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 perenē plena* which in the Vendidad occurs very often in relation to *𐬀𐬀𐬀 zdo* earth without my being able to remember that I have found another case from *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 perenē* But from the nom *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 laniē* maid (Sanskrit कन्या [G Ed p 160] *kanyā*) which is of frequent occurrence I find the accus *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 lanyanm* (V S p 420) this furnishes the proof that the *𐬀𐬀* in the nominative is generated by the euphonic influence of the suppressed *𐬀𐬀 y* (§ 42) In *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 brāturyē* cousin and *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 turryē* a relation in the fourth degree (V S p 380) the *𐬀𐬀 y* has remained on the other hand in *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 nyākkē* grandmother the dropping of a *𐬀𐬀 y* must be again assumed We cannot here refrain from conjecturing that the *e* also of the Latin fifth declension as with very few exceptions it is everywhere preceded by an *i* is likewise produced from *ā* by the influence of this *i* so that the Latin here stands in reversed relation to the Greek where *i* rejects the combination with *η* and preserves the original *α* (σοφία)

138 Bases of the masculine and feminine genders which terminate with a consonant lose in Sanskrit according to § 94 the nominative sign *s* and if two consonants terminate the base then according to the same law the latter of these also is lost Hence *बिभ्रत् bibhrat* for *बिभ्रत्s bibhrat s* the bearer *तुदन् tudan* for *तुदन्s tudant s* the vexer *वाक् vāk* (from *वाच् vāch f*) for *वाच्s vāch sh* speech The Zend Greek and Latin in preserving the nominative sign after consonants stand in an older position than the Sanskrit Zend *𐬀𐬀𐬀 af s* (for *𐬀𐬀𐬀 s* § 40) water



ⲙⲃⲉⲛⲥ *k'īčs*, "body", ⲙⲃⲉⲛⲥ *druc-s* (from the base *dry*), "a demon" The Latin and Greek, where the final consonant of the base will not combine with the *s* of the nominative, prefer abandoning a portion of the base, as *χάρις* for *χάριτ-s*, comes for *comit-s* (cf § 6). The Latin, Æolic, and Lithuanian agree remarkably with the Zend in this point, [G Ed p 161] that *nt*, in combination with *s*, gives the form *ns*, thus *amans*, *τιθεύς*, Lith. *sukans* (§ 10), correspond to the Zend ⲙⲃⲉⲛⲥⲙⲃⲉⲛⲥ *šrāṇayanś*, "the speaking" (man).

139 A final *n* after a short vowel is, in Sanskrit, no favourite combination of sound, although one not prohibited. It is expelled from the theme in the first member of a compound, e.g. *राजपुत्र* *rāja-putra*, "king's son," for *राजपुत्र* *rajan-putra*, and it is rejected in the nominative also, and a preceding short vowel is lengthened in masculines, e.g. *राजा* *rājā*, "king," from *राजन्* *rājan*, m., *नाम* *nāma*, "name," from *नामन्* *nāman*, n, *धनी* *dhanī*, m, *धनि* *dhani*, n, from *धनिन्* *dhanin*, "rich" The Zend in this agrees exactly with the Sanskrit, but from the dislike to a long *a* at the end, which has been before mentioned, omits the lengthening of the vowel, e.g. *ⲙⲃⲉⲛⲥ* *ashava*, "the pure" (man), from *ⲙⲃⲉⲛⲥ* *ashavan*, m, *ⲙⲃⲉⲛⲥ* *chashma*, "eye," from *ⲙⲃⲉⲛⲥ* *chashman*, n The Latin follows the Sanskrit in the suppression of the *n* in the nominative, in the masculine, and feminine, but not in the neuter *sermo*, *sermon-is*, *actio*, *action-is*, but *nomen*, not *nome* or *nomo* The root *can* at the end of compounds, refrains from rejecting the *n*, probably in order not to weaken still more this weak radical syllable, thus *tubī-cēn*, *fidi-cēn*, *os-cēn* (see § 6) *Lien* is an abbreviation of *lienī-s*, hence the retention of the *n* is not surprising *Pecten* stands rather isolated In Sanskrit the naked roots also follow the principle of the rejection of *n*, *हन्* "slaying," "smiting," nom *ह* *hā*, is, however, the only root in *n* which I have

met with so used *यन suan* hound nom *या suā* which in the weakest cases contracts its theme to *युन् sun* is of obscure origin. The Latin has extended the base *यन् suan* in the nominative by an unorganic addition to *cani* so *युवन् yuvan* young has become *juveni* (cf § 126). As regards the opposition [G Ed p 162] between *o* and *i*, by which in several words—as *homo*, *hominis arundo*, *arundinis*—the nominative is distinguished from the oblique cases, this *o* appears to me a stronger vowel\* which compensates for the loss of the *n* and therefore is substituted for the weaker *i* according to the same principle by which in Sanskrit the nom *धनी dhanī* † comes from *धनिन् dhanin*, and in Lithuanian bases in *en* and *un* give in the nominative *u* (= *uo*) for *e* or *u*. Thus from the bases *AKMEN*, stone *SZUN*, hound come the nominatives *akmu su* as in Sanskrit from the primary forms of the same signification *यश्मन् usman* *यन् suan* have arisen *यश्मि asmā* and *या suā*. It does not follow that *hominis* has come from *homonis* ‡ because the old language had *hemo*, *hemonis*, for *homo hominis* but *mon* and *min* are cognate suffixes signifying the same and were originally one, and therefore may be simultaneously affixed to one and the same word.

140 The German language also rejects *i* final *n* of the base in the nominative and in the neuter, in the accu

\* Although its quantity in the actual condition of the language is arbitrary still it appears to have been originally long and to imply a similar contrast to the Greek η ε ω ι For the rest it has been already remarked that between short vowels also exists a difference of gravity (§ 6)

† In bases in *यन् an* the lengthening extends to all the strong cases with the exception of the vocat sing thus not merely *राजा rayā rex* but also *राजानम् rājanam regem* *राजानम् rājanas reges*

‡ I now prefer taking the *i* of *hominis* &c as the weakening of the *o* of *homo*. The relation resembles that of Gothic forms like *ahmin* *ahm n* to the nom and acc *ahma ahman* which preserve the original vowel

sative also, like Sanskrit. In Gothic, in the masculine and neuter where alone, in my opinion, the *n* has an old and original position—an *a* always precedes the *n*. There are, that is to say, only bases in *an*, none in *in* and *un*, the latter termination is foreign to the Sanskrit also.

[G Ed p 163] The *a*, however, is weakened to *i* in the genitive and dative (see § 132), while in Sanskrit, in these cases, as especially in the weakest cases (§ 130), it is entirely dropped\*. Among masculine bases in *an*, in Gothic, exist several words, in which *an* is the whole derivative-suffix, and which therefore correspond to the Sanskrit राजन् *rāj-an*, "king," as "rule." Thus *AH-AN*, "spirit," as "thinker" (*ah-ya*, "I think"), *STAU-AN*, "Judge" (*stau-ya*, "I judge"), whence the nominatives *aha*, *staua*. There are also, as in Sanskrit, some masculine formations in *man*, as, *AHMAN*, "spirit," nom *ahma*, with which perhaps the Sanskrit आत्मन् *âtman*, "soul," nom आत्मा *âtma*, is connected, in case this stands for *âh-man*, and comes from a lost root आह् *âh*, "to think,"† where it is to be remembered that also the root नह् *nah*, "to bind," has, in several places, changed its *h* into *t*. The Gothic *MILH-MAN*, nom *milh-ma*, "cloud," appears to have sprung from the Sanskrit root *mih*, by the addition of an *l*, whence, remarkably enough, by the suffix *a*, and by exchanging the ह् *h* for घ् *gh*, arises the nominal base मेघ *mêgha*, "cloud." In Latin *ming-o* answers to निह् *mih*, and in Greek ὀ-μυχ-έω, the meaning is in the three languages the same.

141 Neuter bases in *an*, after rejecting the *n*, lengthen, in Gothic, the preceding *a* to *ô*, in the nominative, accusa-

\* In case two consonants do not precede the termination अन् *an*, e.g. आत्मन् *âtman-as*, not *âtman-as*, but नान् *nâmn-as*, not *nâman-as*, "nomins."

† Perhaps identical with the actually-occurring आह् *âh*, "to speak," as मन् *man*, "to think," in Zend means also "to speak," whence मन्थ्वा *manthva*, "speech," and in Gothic *MUN-THA*, nom *munths*, "mouth" (§ 66).

tive and vocative which sound the same [G Ed p 164] so that in these cases the Gothic neuter follows the theory of the strong cases (§ 129) which the Sanskrit neuter obeys only in the nom accus and vocat. plural where for example चतुर्वि *chaturvī* : four with a strong theme is opposed to the weak cases like चतुर्भिः *chaturbhis* (instr) चतुर्भ्यः *chaturbhyas*. The *a* also of neuter bases in *an* is lengthened in the nominative accusative and vocative plural in Sanskrit and in Gothic and hence नामान् *nāmān* : Gothic *namōn* *a* run parallel to one another. However in Gothic *namn a* also exists according to the theory of the Sanskrit weakest cases (§ 130) whence proceeds the plural genitive नामान् *nāmān ām* "nominum" while the Gothic *namōn ē* has permitted itself to be led astray by the example of the strong cases and would be better written *namn ē* or *namin ē*.

142 In the feminine declension in German I can find no original bases in *n* as also in Sanskrit there exist no feminines in *an* or *in* but feminine bases are first formed by the addition of the usual feminine character ई, as राज्ञी *rājñi* queen from राजन् *rājān* धनिनी *dhanīni* the rich (fem) from धनिन् *dhanīn* in *n* rich. Gothic feminine substantive bases in *n* exhibit before this consonant either an *ō* (= *ā* § 69) or *ei* these are genuine feminine final vowels to which the addition of *an n* can have been only subsequently made. And already at § 120 a close connection of bases in *ein* (= *in*) with the Sanskrit in ई, and Lithuanian in *i* has been pointed out. Most substantive bases in *ein* are feminine derivatives from masculine neuter adjective bases in *a* under the same relation excluding the modern *n* as in Sanskrit that of सुन्दरी *sundarī* the fair (woman) from सुन्दर *sundara* in *n* beautiful. Gothic substantive bases in *ein* for the most part raise the adjective whence they are derived to an abstract

[G Ed p 165.] e g. *MANAGEIN*, "crowd, nom *manager*, from the adjective base *MANAGA* (nominative masc. *manag-s*, neut *managa-ta*), *MIKILLEIN*, nom. *mikilei*, "greatness," from *MIKILA* (*mikil-s*, *mikila-ta*), "great." As to feminine bases in *ōn*, they have arisen from feminine bases in *ō*, and I have already observed that feminine adjective bases in *ōn* as *BLINDŌN*, nom. *blindō*, gen. *blindōn-s* must be derived, not from their masculine bases in *an*, but from the primitive feminine bases in *ō* (nom *a*, Grimm's strong adjectives) Substantive bases with the genitive feminine in *ōn* presuppose older ones in *ō*, and correspond, where comparison is made with old languages connected in their bases, to Sanskrit feminines in *ā*, Greek in *σ, η*, Latin in *a*, and in these old languages never lead to bases with a final *n* Thus, *TUGGŌN* (pronounced *tungōn*), nom. *tuggō*, answers to the Latin *lingua*, and to the Sanskrit *𑖅𑖅𑖅 jhuvā*, (= *dschihwā*, see § 17.), and *DAURŌN*, nom *daurō*, to the Greek *θύρα*, *VIDŌVŌN*, nom *vidōiō*, "widow," to the Sanskrit *विधवा* *vidhavā*, "the without man" (from the prep. *वि* *vi* and *धवा* *dhava*, "man"), and the Latin *vidua*. It is true that, in *MITATHYŌN*, "measure," nom. *mitathyō*, the suffix *.thyōn* completely answers to the Latin *tion*, e g. in *ACTION*, but here in Latin, too, the *on* is a later addition, as is evinced from the connection of *ti-on* with the Sanskrit suffix *ति* *ti*, of the same import, and Greek *τις* (old *τις*), Gothic *ti*, *thu*, *di* (see § 91) And in Gothic, together with the base *MITATHYŌN* exists one signifying the same, *MITATHI*, nom *mitaths* In *RATHYŌN*, nom. *rathyō*, "account," a relationship with *RATION*, at least in respect of the suffix, is only a seeming one, for in Gothic the word is [G Ed p 166] to be divided thus, *rath-yōn* the *lh* belongs, in the Gothic soil, to the root, whence the strong part *rath-an(a)-s* has been preserved The suffix *yōn*, of *RATHYŌN* therefore corresponds to the Sanskrit *yā*, e g. in *विद्या* *vid-yā*, "knowledge." Of the same origin is *GA-RUN-YŌN*, nom *garunyō*, "inundation"

143 If a few members of a great family of languages have suffered a loss in one and the same place this may be accident and may be explained on the general ground that all sounds in all languages especially when final are subject to abrasion but the concurrence of so many languages in a loss in one and the same place points to relationship or to the high antiquity of such a loss, and in the case before us refers the rejection of an *n* of the base in the nominative to a period before the migration of languages and to the position of the original site of the human races which were afterwards separated. It is surprising therefore that the Greek in this respect shews no agreement with its sisters and in its *v* bases according to the measure of the preceding vowel abandons either merely the nominative sign or the *v* alone never both together. It is a question whether this is a remnant of the oldest period of language or whether the *v* bases carried away by the stream of analogies in the other consonantal declensions and by the example of their own oblique cases which do not permit the remembrance of the *v* to be lost again returned at a comparatively later period into the common and oldest path after they had experienced a similar loss to the Sanskrit Zend &c by which we should be conducted to nominative forms like *ευδαιμω ευδαιμο τερη τερε ταλα̃, ταλα*<sup>2</sup>. I do not venture to decide with positiveness on this point but the latter view appears to be the more probable. It here deserves to be [G Ed p 167] remarked that in German the *n* which in Gothic in the nominative is always suppressed has in more modern dialects made its way in many words from the oblique cases again into the nominative. So early as the Old High German this was the case and in fact in feminine bases in *in* (Gothic *ein* § 70) which in the nominative oppose to the Gothic *ei* the full base *in* as *guotlihhan* glory (see Grimm p 628). In our New High

German the phenomenon is worthy of notice, that many original *n* bases of the masculine gender, through a confusion in the use of language, are, in the singular, treated as if they originally terminated in *na*; i.e. as if they belonged to Grimm's first strong declension. Hence the *n* makes its appearance in the nominative, and the genitive regains the sign *s*, which, indeed, in Gothic, is not wanting in the *n* bases, but in High German was withdrawn from them more than a thousand years since. Thus, *Brunnen*, *Brunnens*, is used instead of the Old High German *prunno*, *prunnin*, and the Gothic *brunna*, *brunnin-s*. In some words, together with the restored *n* there occurs in the nominative, also, the ancient form with *n* suppressed, as *Backe* or *Backen*, *Same* or *Samen*; but the genitive has in these words also introduced the *s* of the strong declension. Among neuters the word *Herz* deserves consideration. The base is, in Old High German, *HERZAN*, in Middle High German *HERZEN*, the nominatives are, *herza*, *herze*, the New German suppresses, together with the *n* of *Herzen*, the vowel also, as is done by many masculine *n* bases, as, e.g. *Bar* for *Bare*. As this is not a transition into the strong declension, but rather a greater weakening of the weak nominative, the form *Herzens*, therefore, in the genitive, for an uninflected *Herzen*, is sur-

[G Ed p 168] prising. With this assumed or newly-restored inflection *s* would be to be compared, in Greek, the nominative *s*, as of *δελφί-s*, *μέλα-s*, and with the *n* of *Brunnen* for *Brunne*, the *ν* of *δαίμων*, *τέρην*, in case, as is rendered probable by the cognate languages, these old forms have been obtained from still older, as *δελφί*, *μέλα*, *δαίμω*, *τίρη*, by an unorganic retrograde step into the stronger declension \*

\* That, in Greek, the renunciation of a *ν* of the base is not entirely unknown may be here shewn by an interesting example. Several cardinal numbers in Sanskrit conclude their base with न् *n*, ११७  
panchan,

144 Bases in ञ् ar (ञ् *ri* § 1) in Sanskrit reject the *r* in the nominative and like those in न् *n* lengthen the preceding vowel e.g. from पितृ *pitar* father भ्रातृ *bhrātār* brother मातृ *mātār* mother दुहितृ *dulitar* daughter come पिता *pitā* भ्राता *bhrātā* माता *mātā* दुहिता *dulitā* The lengthening of the *a* serves I believe, as a compensation for the rejected *r* As to the retention however through all the strong cases, excepting the vocative, of the long *a* of the agent which corresponds to Greek formations in *τηρ τωρ*, and to Latin in *tōr* this takes place because in all probability in these words तार *tār* and not तर् *tar* is the original form of the suffix and this is also supported by the length of the suffix being retained in Greek and Latin through all the cases—*τηρ τωρ tōr* only [G Ed p 109] that in Latin a final *r* in polysyllabic words shortens an originally long vowel Compare

	SANSKRIT	GREEK	LATIN
Nom sing	दाता <i>dātā</i>	δοτηρ	<i>datōr</i>
Acc sing	दाताम् <i>dātār am</i>	δοτήρ α	<i>dator em</i>
N A V dual	दातारौ <i>dātār au</i>	δοτήρ-ε	
Nom Voc pl	दाताम् <i>dātār as</i>	δοτήρ-ες	<i>dotor es</i>

The Zend follows the analogy of the Sanskrit both in the rejection of the *r* in the nominative and in the length

*panchan* five *saptan* seven *ashtan* with *ashtau* eight " *natan* nine *dasan* ten These numerals are indeed used adjectively when they are not governed by the gender of their substantive but display always a neuter form and indeed which is surprising in the nominative accusative and vocative sing terminations but in the other cases the suitable plural endings e.g. पञ्च राजानम् *pancha* (not *panchanas*) *rājānas* 'quinque reges' on the other hand पञ्चसु राज्ञाम् *panchasu rājāsu* "in quinque regibus" To the neuter nominatives and accusative of the singular पञ्च *pancha* सप्त *sapta* नव *nava* and दश *dasa*—which rest on the regular suppression of the *n*—answer the Greek πέντε *ente* ἑπτὰ *hepta* ὀκτώ *oktō* with the distinction that they have become quite indeclinable, and retain the old uninflected nominative through all the cases





of the preceding *a* of the noun agent, in the same places as in the Sanskrit, with the exception of the nominative singular, where the long *a*, as always when final, is shortened, *e g* *पिता* *paita*, "father," *दाता* *dāta*, "giver," "Creator," acc *पितारं* *pitar-āṁ*, *दातारं* *dātār-āṁ*. In Lithuanian there are some interesting remains, but only of feminine bases in *er*, which drop this letter in the nominative, but in most of the oblique cases extend the old *er* base by the later addition of an *i*. Thus *motė*, "wife," *dukte* "daughter," answer to the abovementioned *माता* *mâtâ*, *दुहिता* *duhitâ*, and, in the plural, *moter-es*, *dukter-es*, to *मातरः* *mâtari-as*, *दुहितरः* *duhitar-as*. In the genitive singular I regard the form *moter-s*, *dukter-s*, as the elder and more genuine, and *moteriės*, *dukteriės*, as corruptions belonging to the *i* bases. In the genitive plural the base has kept clear of this unorganic *i*, hence, *moter-ų*, *dukter-ų*, not *moteri-ų*, *dukteri-ų*. Besides the words just mentioned, the base *SESSER*, "sister," belongs to this place it answers to the Sanskrit *स्वसर* *swasar*, nom *स्वसि* *suasâ*, but distinguishes itself in the nominative from *mote* and *dukte*, in that the *e*, after the analogy of bases in *en*, passes into *î*, thus *sessî*.

[G Ed p 170] 145. The German languages agree in their *r* bases (to which but a few words belong denoting affinity) with the Greek and Latin in this point, that, contrary to the analogy just described, they retain the *r* in the nominative. As *πατήρ*, *μητήρ*, *θυγάτηρ*, *δαήρ* (Sanskrit, *देव* *dēvar*, *देवृ* *dēvri*, nom *देवा* *dēvâ*), *frater*, *soror*, so in Gothic, *bróthar*, *svistar*, *dauhtar*, in Old High German, *vatar*, *pruodar*, *suestar*, *tohtar*. It is a question whether this *r* in the nominative is a remnant of the original language, or, after being anciently suppressed, whether it has not again made its way in the actual condition of the language from the oblique cases into the nominative. I think the latter more probable, for the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian are three witnesses

for the antiquity of the suppression of the *r* and the Greek words like *τατιρ μητηρ σωτηρ, ρητωρ* exhibit something peculiar and surprising in the consonantal declension in that *p* and *s* not combining they have not rather preferred giving up the base-consonant than the case sign (as *ταῖς ποῦς* &c) It would appear that the form *της* is of later origin for this reason that the *p* having given place to the nominative *s* the form *της*, whence *τηρ-ος* should come was by an error of language made to correspond to the *η-ς* of the first declension The want of a cognate form in Latin as in *Lead* and *Sanskrit*, as also the in other respects cognate form and similarity of meaning with *πῆρ* (*dr* *dr-r* *τιρ* and *τωρ* speak at least plurally enough for the spuriousness and comparative youth of the nouns of agency in *της*

116 Masculine and feminine primary forms in *सम्* as in *Sanskrit* lengthen the *a* in the nominative singular They are for the most part compounded and contain as the 1st member a neuter substantive in *सम्* as as *दुर्मान* *durmanas* evil minded from *दुस्* *duś* [G 11 p 11] (before sonant letters—§ 20—*दुर्* *dur*) and *मान* *manas* mind whence the nom *मनस* and *स्म* *दुर्मानस* *durmanas* neut *दुर्मान* *durmanas* A remarkable agreement is here shewn by the Greek, in *δυσμενής* ο η opposed to το *δυσμενής* The *स्* of *दुर्मानस* however belongs though unrecognised to the base and the nominative character is wanting according to § 91 In Greek, on the other hand the *ς* of *δυσμενής* has the appearance of an inflexion because the genitive &c is not *δυσμενέος* like the *Sanskrit* *दुर्मानस* as but *δυσμενέος* If, however what was said at § 128 is admitted that the *ς* of *μενός* belongs to the base and *μενέος* is abbreviated from *μενέος-ος* then in the compound *δυσμενής* also and all similar adjectives a *ς* belonging to the base must be recognised and the form *δυσμενέος* must lie at the bottom of the genitive *δυσμενέος* In the

nominative, therefore, either the *s* belongs to the base, and then the agreement with दुर्मेनास् *durmanās* would be complete, or the *s* of the base has been dropped before the case-sign *s*. The latter is, in my opinion, least probable, for the former is supported by the Latin also, where the forms which answer to the Sanskrit *as* bases are in the nom. masc. and fem. in like manner without the case-sign. Thus the Sanskrit comparative suffix is ईयस् *īyas* the last *a* but one of which is lengthened in the strong cases, and invested with a dull nasal (Anuswāna, § 9)—in Latin, *rōi*, with the *i* changed into *r*, which so frequently happens, and the nominative in both genders is without the case-sign the originally long *o*, however, is shortened by the influence of the final *i*. In the neuter *ūs* corresponds to the Sanskrit अस् *as*, because *u* is favourable to a final *s*, and prevents its transition into *r*, hence *gravius* has the same relation to the Sanskrit गरीयस् *garīyas* (irregular from गुरु *guru*, “heavy,”) as *lupus* to

[G Ed p 172] वृक्षस् *vilas*, only that the *s* of the nominative character in the latter belongs in the former to the base. The final syllable *ör*, though short, must nevertheless be held, in Latin, as graver than *ūs*, and hence *gravior* forms a similar antithesis to *gravius* that in Greek *δυσμενής* does to *δυσμενές*, and in Sanskrit दुर्मेनास् *durmanās* to दुर्मेनस् *durmanas*.

147 In Lithuanian a nominative, which stands quite isolated, *menū* (= *menuo*), “moon” and “month,” deserves here to be mentioned. it proceeds from the primary form *MENES*\*, and, in regard to the suppression of the final consonant and the transformation of the preceding vowel, has the same relation to it that, as above (§ 139), *akmū* has

\* The relation of this to मास् *mās*, which signifies the same—from मास् *mās*, “to measure,” without a derivative suffix—is remarkable, for the interposed nasal syllable *ne* answers to the Sanskrit न *na* in roots of the seventh class (see p 118), and in this respect *MENES* bears the same relation to the Latin *MENSI* that ल *l* c भिनत्ति *bhinadmi* does to *findo*

to *AA VFA sessu* to *SESSFR* in the oblique cases, also the *s* of the base again re-appears but receives as in the *er* and *en* bases an unorganic increase thus the genitive is *mensin* whence *VI VISA* is the theme, as *uiklo lupi* from *II ILK* 1 nom *uikla s*

148 In neuters throughout the whole Sanskrit family of languages the nominative is identical with the accusative, which subject is treated of at § 150 &c We here give a general view of the nominative formation and elect for the several terminations and gender of the primary forms both for these cases and for all others which suit our purpose the following examples Sanskrit *वृक uikla* m wolf *क ka* who? *दान dāna* n gift *तत् tat* n this *जिह्वा jihvā* f tongue *का kā* which? *पति pati* m lord husband *प्रीति prīti* f love *पारिद्रि n* water *भविष्यती भविष्यती* who is about to be *सुसुनु m* son [C 1d 1 173] *तनु tanu* f body *मधु mādhu* n 'honey wine' *पथ path* f wife *मोक्ष m* f bullock cow *जिह्वा jihvā* f ship Of the consonantal declension we select only such final consonants as occur most frequently whether in single words or in entire classes of words *पाच rāch* f speech *भरन् bharant* in the weakened form *भरत blarat* (§ 109) m n bearing receiving from *भर bhar* (भृ bhri) cl 1 *चित् chit* m soul *नाम nāman* n name *भ्रातर bhrātar* m brother *दुहितृ dūhitar* f daughter *दातृ dātār* m giver *वचन vacana* n speech Greek *ΠΡΟΣ* *ēnos* (§§ 14 129) for *FFΠΡΣ* *Fe nos* Land *αἰὲς* *aiēs* *uikla* m wolf *ὅς ka* m who? *ἀδότης* *adōtis* n datum *ὅτα ta* n this, *ὅγλωσσος* *hōglōssos* f tongue *ὅκα kā* which?

\* Masculines and f minines in the consonantal declension agree in all cases hence an example of one of the two genders is sufficient The only exception is the accusative plural of words denoting relationship in *वर ar* (चु 114) which form this case from the abbreviated theme in *चु ri*





	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUANIAN	GOthic
n.	<i>dāna-m,</i>	<i>dātē-m,</i>	<i>δῶρο-ν,</i>	<i>donum,</i>	<i>géra,</i>	<i>daur'.</i>
n.	<i>ta-t,</i>	<i>ta-t,</i>	<i>τό,</i>	<i>is-tu-d,</i>	<i>ta-i,</i>	<i>tha-ta</i>
f.	<i>jihvā,</i>	<i>hizva,</i>	<i>χώρα,</i>	<i>terra,</i>	<i>rankà,</i>	<i>giba</i>
f.	<i>kā,</i>	<i>kā,</i>	....	....	....	<i>hvó</i>
m	<i>pati-s,</i>	<i>pati-s,</i>	<i>πόσι-ς,</i>	<i>hosti-s,</i>	<i>pati-s,</i>	<i>gast'-s.</i>
m.	..	.	...	<i>i-s,</i>	...	<i>i-s.</i>
f	<i>prāti-s,</i>	<i>āfrāti-s</i>	<i>πόρτι-ς,</i>	<i>siti-s,</i>	<i>auri-s,</i>	<i>anst'-s</i>
n	<i>vāri,</i>	<i>vāri,</i>	<i>ἴδρι,</i>	<i>mare,</i>	..	....
[G Ed p. 176] n.	..	.	...	<i>i-d,</i>	...	<i>i-ta</i>
f.	<i>bhavishyanti,</i>	<i>bāshyanti*</i>	....	.	<i>būsentī,</i>	....
m.	<i>sānu-s,</i>	<i>paśu-s,</i>	<i>ἰχθύ-ς,</i>	<i>pecu-s,</i>	<i>sunū-s,</i>	<i>sunu-s</i>
f	<i>tanu-s,</i>	<i>tanu-s,</i>	<i>πίτυ-ς,</i>	<i>socru-s,</i>	.	<i>handu-s</i>
n.	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>μέθυ,</i>	<i>pecu,</i>	<i>darkū,</i>	<i>faīhu</i>
f	<i>vadhū-s,</i>	..	.	....	.	.
m f	<i>gāu-s,†</i>	<i>gāu-s,‡</i>	<i>βοῦ-ς,</i>	<i>bō-s,</i>	.	.
f	<i>nāu-s,</i>	...	<i>ναῦ-ς,</i>	..	..	.
f	<i>vāk,</i>	<i>vāc-s,</i>	<i>ὄπ-ς,</i>	<i>voc-s,</i>	.	..
m	<i>bharan,</i>	<i>baran-s,</i>	<i>φέρων,</i>	<i>feren-s,</i>	<i>sukan-s,</i>	<i>fiyand-s'</i>
m	<i>ātma',</i>	<i>aśma,*</i>	<i>δαίμων,</i>	<i>seimo',</i>	<i>ahmū',</i>	<i>ahmā'.</i>
n.	<i>nāma',</i>	<i>nāma',</i>	<i>τάλαν,</i>	<i>nomen,</i>	..	<i>namō'.</i>
m	<i>bhrātā',</i>	<i>brātā',*</i>	<i>πατήρ,</i>	<i>frater,</i>	....	<i>bīōthar</i>
f.	<i>duhitā',</i>	<i>dughdha,*</i>	<i>θυγάτηρ,</i>	<i>matr,</i>	<i>dukte',</i>	<i>dauhtan</i>
m.	<i>dātā,</i>	<i>dātā',*</i>	<i>δοτήρ,</i>	<i>dator,</i>	..	.
n.	<i>vachas,</i>	<i>vachō,</i>	<i>ἔπος,</i>	<i>opus,</i>	..	....

## ACCUSATIVE

## SINGULAR.

149 The character of the accusative is *m* in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin, in Greek *ν*, for the sake of euphony. In Lithuanian the old *m* has become still more weakened to

\* See the marginal note marked (‡) on the foregoing page

† Irregularly for *gō-s*.

‡ Or *gāos*, § 33

the dull re-echoing nasal which in Sanskrit is called Anu

[G Ed p 177] swara and which we in both languages express by *n* (§ 10) The German languages have so early as the Gothic even lost the accusative mark in substantives entirely but in pronouns of the 3d person, as also in adjective bases ending with a vowel which follow their declension they have hitherto retained it still only in the masculine the feminine nowhere exhibits an accusative character and is like its nominative devoid of inflexion The Gothic gives *na* instead of the old *m* the High German with more correctness a simple *n* hence Gothic *blind na* 'caecum' Old High German *plinta n* Middle and Modern High German *blinde n*

150 Primary forms terminating with a consonant prefix to the case sign *m* a short vowel as otherwise the combination would be, in most cases impossible thus in Sanskrit *am* in Zend and Latin *em* appears as the accusative termination\* of the Greek *av*, which must originally have existed the *v* is in the present condition of the language lost examples are given in § 157

151 Monosyllabic words in *i* *ū* and *du* in Sanskrit like consonantal bases, give *am* in place of the mere *m* as the accusative termination probably in order in this way to become polysyllabic Thus *भी bhī* fear and *नी नी* ship form not *bhī m* and *nī m* as the Greek *vav v* would

\* I from the bases *द्रुज् druj* and *वृक्ष vāch* I find besides *दृष्टम् drūṣṭam*, *वृक्षम् vācham* in the V S also frequently *दृष्टम् drūṣṭam* *वृक्षम् vācham* and if these forms are genuine which I scarcely doubt they are to be thus explained—that the vowel which stands before *m* is only a means of conjunction for appending the *m*, for this purpose however the Zend uses besides the *ε* mentioned at § 30 not unfrequently *ai*, e.g. for *दालमह दालमह dālemah* occurs also *दालमह दालमह dālimah* and many similar forms, as *वसुमह वसुमह vasu mah* answering to the Sanskrit *वसुस् usmas* (in the Vedas *वसुस् usmasi*), we will





place both of nominative and accusative in Sanskrit मधु *madhu* honey wine अश्रु *asru* tear सद्दु *saddu* sweet in Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 *rōhu* wealth (Sanskrit पशु *pasu*) in Greek μῆνυ *ḗkpu ḗdu* in Latin pecu genu The length of this *u* is unorganic, and has probably passed into the nominative accusative and vocative from the oblique cases where the length is to be explained from the suppressed case terminations. With regard to the fact that final *u* is always long in Latin there is perhaps a reason always at hand for this length in the ablative, for example the length of the originally short *u* is explicable as a compensation for the case sign which has been dropped by which too the *o* of the second declension becomes long. The original shortness of the *u* of the fourth declension is perceivable from the dat pl *u bus*. The Σ in Greek words like γένος μένος κύκλος, has been already explained at § 128 as belonging to the basis the σίμο is the basis with the Latin *e* in neuters like *genus corpus gravior* it is the other form of the *r* of the oblique cases like *generis corporis gravioris* (see § 127) and *corpus* appears akin to the Sanskrit neuter of the σίμο meaning ययुस् *ayus* gen ययुस *ayus sh as* (see § 19) and would consequently have an *r* too much or the Sanskrit has lost one.\* The Σ also of neuter bases in T, in τετρυφος *trpas* does not seem to me to be the case sign but an exchange with T which is not admissible at the end but is either rejected (μὲν πρᾶγμα) or exchanged [G Ed p 180] for a cognate Σ as πρὸς from πρῶτι Sanskrit प्रति *prati* †

\* Compare in this respect *brachium* βραχίον, with ब्रिहति *bṛiṭis* 'arm', *frango*, πρηνυμι with भ्रंज्म *bhānjmi* I break भ्रंज्म *bhānjmas* we break.

† With this view which I have already developed in my treatise On some Demonstrative Bases and their connection with various Propositions and Conjunctions (Berlin by Dammeler), pp 4—6 corresponds as to the essential points what Hartung has since said on this subject

In Latin it is to be regarded as inconsistent with the spirit of the language, that most adjective bases ending with a consonant retain the nominative sign *s* of the two natural genders in the neuter, and in this gender extend it also to the accusative, as if it belonged to the base, as *capac-s felic-s, soler(t)s, aman(t)s*. In general, in Latin, in consonantal bases, the perception of the distinction of gender is very much blunted, as, contrary to the principle followed by the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Gothic, the feminine is no longer distinguished from the masculine.

153 In Gothic substantives, as well neuter as masculine, the case sign *m* is wanting, and hence neuter bases in *a* stand on the same footing with the *i, u*, and consonantal bases of the cognate languages in that, in the nominative and accusative, they are devoid of all inflexion. Compare, with regard to the form of this case, *daur(a)* with *दासम् dwâram*, which has the same meaning. In Gothic there are no neuter substantives in *i*, on the other hand, the

[G Ed p 181] substantive bases in *ya*, by suppression of the *a* in the nominative and accusative singular (cf § 135), gain in these cases the semblance of *i* bases, *e.g.* from the base *REIKYA*, "rich" (Sanskrit *राज्य राज्यā*, likewise neuter), comes, in the case mentioned, *reiki*, answering to the Sanskrit *राज्यम् राज्यā-m*. The want of neuter *i* bases

subject in his valuable work on "On the Cases," p 152, &c, where also the *ρ* of *ἥπαρ* and *ὕδωρ* is explained as coming from *T*, through the intervention of *Σ*. The Sanskrit, however, appears to attribute a different origin to the *ρ* of these forms. To *यकृत yakrit* "liver" (likewise neuter), corresponds both *jecur* and *ἥπαρ*, through the common interchange between *h* and *p* both owe to it then *ρ*, as *ἥπαρ-os* does its *τ*. *ἥπαρ-os* should be *ἥπαρ-os*, Sanskrit *यकृतस् yakrit-as*. But the Sanskrit also in this word, in the weak cases, can give up the *i*, but then irregularly substitutes *न् n* for *त् t*, *e.g.* gen *यकृतस् yakn-as* for *यकृतस् yakanas*. With regard to the *ρ* of *ὕδωρ*, compare *उद्ग ūdga*, "water," in *समुद्ग sam-udra*, "sea"

in German is the less surprising that in the cognate Sanskrit Zend and Greek the corresponding termination in the neuter is not very common. — Of neuter *u* roots the substantive declension has preserved only the single *TAIHU* beast. In Lithuanian the neuter in substantives is entirely lost, and has left traces only in pronouns and adjectives, where the latter relate to pronouns. Adjective bases in *u* in this case have their nominative and accusative singular in accordance with the cognate languages, without case sign *e g darku* ugly corresponds as nominative and accusative neuter to the masculine nominative *darku* & accusative *darku n*. This analogy, however is followed in Lithuanian by the adjective bases in *a* also and thus *gera* good corresponds as nominative and accusative to the masculine forms *gera* & *gera n*\* which are provided with the sign of the case.

[G Ed p 182] 154 It is a question whether the *m* as the sign of the nominative and accusative neuter (it is excluded from the vocative in Sanskrit and Zend) was originally limited simply to the *a* bases and was not joined to the

\* The *e* of neuter forms like *dide* great from the base *DIDIA*—nom masc *didis* for *didya* & as § 135 \* *yaunihis* youngling —I explain through the euphonic influence of the suppressed *y*. As also the feminine originally long *a* is changed into *e* by the same influence so is the nominative and accusative neuter in such words identical with the nominative feminine which is likewise according to § 137, devoid of inflexion and *dide* therefore signifies also ‘*magna*’ and answers, as feminine very remarkably to the Zend nominatives explained at § 137 as *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 perenē 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 braturjē*. In this sense are to be regarded also the feminine substantives in Rnbig a third declension as far as they terminate in the nominative in *e* as *giesme*, song. As no masculine forms in *is* correspond to them the discovery of the true nature of these words becomes more difficult for the lost *y* or *i* has been preserved only in the genitive plural where *giesmy u* is to be taken like *rank u* from *rank i* & the final vowel of the bases is suppressed before the termination, or has been melted down with it.

*i* and *u* bases also, so that, in Sanskrit, for *vāri* we had originally *vāri-m*, for *madhu*, *madhu-m*? I should not wish to deny the original existence of such forms, for why should the *a* bases alone have felt the necessity of not leaving the nominative and accusative neuter without a sign of relation or of personality? It is more probable that the *a* bases adhered only the more firmly to the termination once assumed, because they are by far the most numerous, and could thus present a stronger opposition to the destructive influence of time by means of the greater force of their analogies, in the same way as the verb substantive, in like manner, on account of its frequent use, has allowed the old inflexion to pass less into oblivion, and in German has continued to our time several of the progeny of the oldest period, as, for instance, the nasal, as characteristic of the 1st person in *bi-n*, Old High German *pi-m* Sans भवामि *bhavā-mi*. In Sanskrit, one example of an *m* as the nominative and accusative sign of an *i* base is not wanting, although it stands quite isolated, and indeed this form occurs in the pronominal declension, which everywhere remains longest true to the traditions of bygone ages. I mean the interrogative form किम् *ki-m*, "what"? from the base कि *ki*, which may perhaps, in Sanskrit, have produced a *ki-t*, which is contained in the Latin *qui-d*, and which I recognise again, also, in the enclitic चित् *chit*, weakened from किन् *ki-t*. Otherwise *i* or *u*-bases of pronouns in the nominative accusative neuter do not occur, for अमु *amu*, "that" (mān), substitutes अदस् *adas*, and इ *i*, "this," combines with [G Ed p 183] दम् *dam* (इदम् *idam*, "this"). Concerning the original procedure of consonantal bases in the nominative and accusative neuters no explanation is afforded by the pronominal declension, as all primary forms of pronouns terminate in vowels, and, indeed, for the most part, in *a*.

155 Pronominal bases in *a* in Sanskrit give *t*, in Zend *t*, as the inflexion of the nominative and accusative neuter. The

Gothic gives, as in the accusative masculine *na* for *m* or *n* so here *ta* for simple *t* and transfers these like other peculiarities of the pronominal declension as in the other German dialects also to the adjective *a* bases *c g blinda ta cæcum midya ta medium* The High German gives in the older period *z* instead of the Gothic *t* (§ 87) in the most modern period *s* The pronominal base *I* (later *E*) follows in German as in Latin the analogy of the old *a* bases and the Latin gives as in the old ablative *d* instead of *t* The Greek must abandon all *T* sounds at the end of words the difference of the pronominal from the common *o* declension consists therefore in this respect merely in the absence of all inflexion From this difference, however and the testimony of the cognate languages, it is perceived that *to* was originally sounded *τοτ* or *τοδ* for a *τον* would have remained unaltered as in the masculine accusative Perhaps we have a remnant of a neuter inflexion *τ* in *ἄττι* so that we ought to divide *στ τι* and therefore the double *τ* in this form would no more have a mere metrical foundation than the double *σ* (§ 128) in *ῥοσσ σι* (Buttmann p 85)

156 We find the origin of the neuter case sign *t* in the pronominal base *π ta* he thus (Greek *TO* Goth *THA*, &c) and a convincing proof of the correctness of this explanation is this that *π ta t* it this stands in regard to the base in the same contrast with *स sa* he *सा sã* she, as *t* as the neuter case sign does to [G Ed p 181] the nominative *s* of masculine and feminine nouns (§ 134) The *m* of the accusative also is I doubt not of pronominal origin and it is remarkable that the compound pronouns *i ma* this and *a mu* that occur just as little as *ta* in the nominative masculine and feminine but the Sanskrit substitutes for the base *amu* in the nominative masculine and feminine singular the form *asãu* the *s* of which therefore stands in the same relation to the *m* of *अमुम् amum* 'illum' *अमुम् amu shya illius* and other oblique cases, as among

the case-terminations, the sign of the masculine feminine nominative to the *m* of the accusative and neuter nominative. Moreover, in Zend is used  $\text{इमं } imat$ , "this," (n) (nom accus), but not  $imā$ , "this" (m), but  $\text{अयम् } aēm$  (from  $\text{अयम् } ayam$ ), and  $\text{इमं } im$  (from  $\text{इयम् } iyam$ ), "this" (f). Observe in Greek the pronominal base *MI*, which occurs only in the accusative, and, in regard to its vowel, has the same relation to *ma* (in the compounded base  $\text{इम } i-ma$ ) that  $\text{किम् } ki-m$  "what?" has to  $\text{कस् } ka-s$  "who?" The Gothic neut termination *ta* answers, in respect to the transposition of sound (§. 87), to the Latin *d* (*id, istud*) this Latin *d*, however, seems to me a descent from the older *t*, as, e.g., the *b* of *āb* has proceeded from the *p* of the cognate  $\text{अप } apa$ ,  $\text{ἀπό } apo$ , and in Zend the *d* of  $\text{इदम् } ā-dēm$ , "him," is clearly only a weakening of the *t* of  $\text{तम् } ta$ ,  $\text{तम् } ta$  |

[G Ed p 185] 157. To the Sanskrit *ta-t*, mentioned above, Zend *ta-t*, Greek  $\text{τό } \&c$ , corresponds a Lithuanian *tai*, "the," as the nominative and accusative singular. I do not believe, however, that the *i* which is here incorporated in the base *TA*

\* The *ā* of  $\text{ā-dēm}$  is the preposition corresponding to the Sansk. *ā*

† See my treatise "On the Origin of the Cases" in the Trans of the Berlin Academy for the year 1826. As *T* in Greek easily becomes  $\Sigma$  (but a final  $\Sigma$  has in many parts of Grammar become  $\nu$ ), Hartung founds on this, in the pamphlet before mentioned, p 154, the acute conjecture of an original identity of neuters in  $\nu$  (*m*) with those in *t*. We cannot, however, agree with him in this, because the *m*, on account of the origin which we ascribe to this case-sign, is as little surprising in the nominative of the neuter as in the accusative of the more animated genders, and besides, a greater antiquity is proved to belong to the neuter *m*, through the Sanskrit and Zend, than probably the  $\nu$  sounds can boast, which, in Greek, stand for an older  $\Sigma$ , as  $\mu\epsilon\nu$  for  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  ( $\text{मस् } mas$ ), and in the dual  $\tau\omicron\nu$ ,  $\tau\omicron\nu$  for  $\text{यस् } thas$ ,  $\text{तस् } tas$ . What is wanting in the Greek, viz a neuter inflexion *s*, appears, however, to be possessed by the Sanskrit, and I am inclined to divide the form  $\text{अदस् } adas$ , "that" (nom accus) into *a-da-s*, and to explain it as a corruption of *a-da-t* (cf Gramm. Crit Addend to r 299), but to regard the syllable *da* as weakened from *ta*, as in the Zend  $\text{इदम् } ā-dēm$ , "him." We shall recur to this when treating of the pronouns

is any way connected with the neuter *it*, *d* of the cognate languages I should rather turn to a relationship with the demonstrative in the Greek (*οὗτος εκεινός*) and to the इत् *it* which is in like manner used enclitically in the Veda—*a* petrified neuter which is no longer conscious of any gender or case and hence, in several cases, combining with masculine pronouns of the third person \* This इत् *it* is consequently the sister form of the Latin *id* and Gothic *it* which in the Greek *εκεινός* has perhaps only from necessity, dropped the *τ* or *δ* and which already ere I was acquainted with the Veda dialect I represented as a consistent part of the conjunctions चेत् *chē* (from *cha* + *it*) if and नेत् *ne* (*na* + *it*) [G Ed p 186]

The words mentioned at § 148 form in the accusative

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
m	<i>urika m</i>	<i>uehrke-m</i> ,	<i>λυκο ν</i>	<i>lupu-m</i>	<i>wilka-n</i>	<i>wulf</i>
m	<i>ka m</i>	<i>ke m</i>			<i>ka-n</i>	<i>hwa-na</i>
n	<i>dāna m</i>	<i>dāle-m</i> ,	<i>δῶπο :</i>	<i>donu m</i>	<i>gera</i> ,	<i>daur</i>
n	<i>ta t</i>	<i>ta t</i>	<i>το</i>	<i>is tu-d</i>	<i>ta i</i> ,	<i>tha ta</i>
f	<i>jihua-m</i>	<i>hu-va nm</i>	<i>χωρα ν</i>	<i>terram</i>	<i>ranka n</i>	<i>giba</i>
f	<i>hā m</i>	<i>ka-nm</i>				<i>hūō †</i>

\* Examples are given by Rosen in his Veda Specimen pp 24 25 which though short are in the highest degree interesting for Sanskrit and comparative Grammar as सद् *sad* he तमिन् *tamit* him तस्मिन् *taśmīn* of these two तस्मिन् *tasmā* *t* 'to him' अस्मिन् *asmā* *t* to this (m) The Zend combines in the same way *yo e* or *ya :* with the interrogative *hasē* and *hasi*, who ? occur frequently Perhaps only one of the two modes of writing is correct Cf Gramm Crit Addend to r 770

† One would expect *hūō-na*, or with abbreviation of the base *hūa na*, which would be the same as the masculine With regard to the lost case termination it may be observed that, in general the feminines are less constant in handing down the old inflexions A charge which is incurred by the Sanskrit in the nominative since it gives *ka* for *hā s\** (§ 137) is incurred by the Gothic (for in this manner the corruption spreads) in the accusative also



	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
m.	<i>pati-m,</i>	<i>paiti-m,</i>	<i>πόσι-ν,</i>	<i>hostem,</i>	<i>páti-n,</i>	<i>gaſt.</i>
m.	. . .	. .	. . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	<i>i-na.</i>
f.	<i>piſti-m,</i>	<i>âfrîſti-m,</i>	<i>πίστι-ν,</i>	<i>siti-m,</i>	<i>âvzi-n,</i>	<i>anst'.</i>
n	<i>vâti,</i>	<i>vairi,</i>	<i>ἴδρι,</i>	<i>mare,</i>	. . . . .	. . .
n	. . . . .	. . .	. . .	<i>i-d,</i>	. . .	<i>i-la.</i>
f	<i>bhavishyanti-m,</i>	<i>bûshyanti-m,</i>	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . . <sup>†</sup>	. . .
[G. Ed. p. 187] m	<i>sînu-m,</i>	<i>paſû-m,</i>	<i>ἰχθύ-ν,</i>	<i>pecu-m,</i>	<i>sunu-n,</i>	<i>sunu</i>
f	<i>tanu-m,</i>	<i>tanû-m,</i>	<i>πίτυ-ν,</i>	<i>socru-m,</i>	. . .	<i>handu</i>
n	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>μέθυ,</i>	<i>pecu,</i>	<i>daikù,</i>	<i>faihu.</i>
f	<i>vadhû-m,</i>	. . . . .	. . .	. . .	. . . . .	. . .
m f	<i>gâ-m,†</i>	<i>ga-nm,†</i>	<i>βοῦ-ν,</i>	<i>boi-ēm,</i>	. . .	. . .
f.	<i>nâv-am,</i>	. . . . .	<i>ναῦ-ν,</i>	. . .	. . . . .	. . . . .
f.	<i>vâch-am,</i>	<i>vâch-ēm,</i>	<i>ὄπ-α,</i>	<i>voc-em,</i>	. . .	. . .

† The feminine participial bases in *i*, mentioned at § 119, remain free from foreign commixture only in the nominative and vocative singular in all other cases, to the old *i* is further added a more modern *a*, and the declension then follows *RAVKA* exactly, only that in some cases, through the euphonic influence of the *i*, and in analogy with the Zend and the Latin fifth declension (§ 137.), the added *a* becomes, or may become, *e* in the latter case the *i* is suppressed, as *λεῖψος* *kamê* for *kamyê* (§ 42). Thus, from *sukanti*, “the turning” (f), *sukusi*, “the having turned” (f), and *suksenti*, “the about to turn,” Mielcke gives the accusatives *sukan-czen* (see p 138, Note) or *suhanczian*, *sukusen*, and *suksenczen* or *suh-senczian*. And even if, according to Ruhig (by Mielcke, pp 3, 4), the *i* before *a*, *e*, *o*, *u* is scarcely heard, it must not therefore, in this case, as well as in those there enumerated, be the less regarded as etymologically present, and it was originally pronounced so as to be fully audible. From the feminine, where the *i*, as Sanskrit grammar shows, has an original position, this vowel appears to have made its way, in Lithuanian participial bases, into the oblique cases of the masculine, and to be here invested with a short masculine *a*. The accusative *sukanti-n*, “the turning” (masc), is therefore to be regarded in the same light as *yaunikhri-n*, from the theme *YAUNIKYA*, *i e* it stands for *sukantyr-n* from *sukantya-n*, and hence answers to the Zend accusatives, like *ἰσῆρ* *tûri m* for *tûryim* (§ 42), and to the Gothic, like *har* from the base *HARYA* (§. 135).

† See § 122

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
m	<i>bharant am</i>	<i>barent em</i>	φεροιτ α	<i>ferent em</i>		<i>fiyand</i>
m	<i>ātman am</i>	<i>asman ěm,</i>	δαιμον α	<i>sermon em,</i>		<i>ahman</i>
n	<i>nāma</i>	<i>nāma,</i>	ταλαν	<i>nomen</i>		<i>namō</i>
m	<i>bhratar am,</i>	<i>bratar em</i>	πατερ α	<i>fratr em</i>		<i>brōthar</i>
f	<i>duhitar am</i>	<i>dughdhar em</i>	θυγατερ α,	<i>matr em,</i>		<i>dauhtar</i>
m	<i>dātur-am</i>	<i>datār em</i>	δοτηρ α	<i>dator em</i>		
n	<i>vachas</i>	<i>vacho *</i>	επος	<i>opus,</i>		

## INSTRUMENTAL DATIVE

159 The instrumental is denoted in Sanskrit by  $\text{ॠ } d$ , and this inflexion is in my opinion  $\text{ॠ}$  [G Ed p 188] lengthening of the pronominal base  $\text{ॠ } a$  and identical with the preposition  $\text{ॠ } d$  to towards up to which springs from this pronoun and appears only as a prefix. The Zend  $\text{ॠ}$  appears still more decidedly in its pronominal nature in the compound mentioned at § 156 Note \*  $\text{ॠ } d\text{em}$   $\text{liim}$  thus (m)  $\text{scm}$   $\text{ॠ } d\text{-danm}$  As a case sign  $\text{ॠ}$  a generally appears abbreviated (see p 163 Note †), even where this termination has been melted into one with a preceding  $\text{ॠ } a$  of the base so that in this case the primary form and the instrumental are completely similar e.g.  $\text{ॠ } d\text{sha}$  voluntarily  $\text{ॠ } d\text{sha}$  involuntarily (V S p 12)  $\text{ॠ } d\text{sha}$   $\text{skyaothna}$ , actione often occur,  $\text{ॠ } d\text{sha}$  through this (m)  $\text{ॠ } d\text{sha}$   $\text{paiti bereta}$  alleviato † The long  $\text{ॠ}$  appears in the instrumental only in monosyllabic bases in  $\text{ॠ } a$  thus  $\text{ॠ } d\text{sha}$   $\text{proprio}$  (V S p 46) from the base  $\text{ॠ } d\text{sha}$  (Sanskrit  $\text{ॠ } sua$  § 33) In Sanskrit a euphonic  $\text{ॠ } n$  is added to bases ending with short vowels in the masc

See § 50<sup>o</sup>

† Cf Gramm Crit r 638 Rem This interesting instrumental form was not known by Rash when he published his work on the Zend and it was not easy to discover it on account of its discrepancy from the Sanskrit and the many other forms with final  $\text{ॠ } a$

and neut genders, a final अ *a*, however, is, as in several other cases, changed into ए *é*; and the आ *á* of the case-suffix is shortened, as it appears to me, by the influence of this clog of the base, as वृक्षेण *vríkṣe-n-a*, but अग्निना *agní-n-á*, वारिणा *várin-n-á*, सूनुना *sūnu-n-á*, मधुना *madhu-n-á*, from वृक्ष *vríkṣa*, &c. The Vêdas, however, exhibit further remains of formations without the euphonic *n*, as स्वप्नाय *swapnay-á* for स्वप्नेन *swapné-n-a* from स्वप्न *suapna*, m “sleep” (see § 133), उरुया *uru-y-á* for उरुणा *uru-n-a*, from उरु *uru*, “great,” with a euphonic य *y* (§ 43), प्रबाह्या *prabâhva-á*, from प्रबाहु *prabâhu*, from बाहु *bâhu*, “arm,” with the preposition

[G. Ed p 189] प्र *pra* The Vêda-form स्वप्नाय *swapnayá*, finds analogies in the common dialect in मया *mayá*, “through me,” and त्वया *twayá*, “through thee,” from the bases *ma* and *tua*, the *a* of which in this case, as in the loc, passes into *é*. And from पति *pati*, m “Lord,” and सखि *sakhī*, m “friend,” the common dialect forms instrumentals without the interposition of न् *n*, viz. पत्य *paly-á*, सख्य *sakhy-á*. Femmines never admit a euphonic *n*, but *á*, as before some other vowel terminations, passes into ए *é*, that is to say, *i* is blended with it, and it is shortened to अ *a*; hence, जिह्वया *jihway-á* (from *jihvé + á*). The Zend follows in this the analogy of the Sanskrit

159 As *é* in Gothic, according to § 69, just like *ø*, represents आ *á*, so the forms *thé*, *hwé*, which Grimm (pp 790 and 798) regards as instrumentals, from the demonstrative base *THA* and the interrogative *HVA*, correspond very remarkably to the Zend instrumentals, as *khá* from the base *kha*. We must, however, place also *své* in the class of genuine Zend instrumental forms, which have been correctly preserved besides *své* from *SVA* is also,

\* The original has “Stammen gen masc und fem,” but genitives of nouns in *a* do not take a euphonic *n*, nor do feminine nouns ending in short vowels use such an augment in the instrumental. There is no doubt some typographic error — Editor

in respect of its base akin to *as* *lha* from *lha* (§ 30)\*. The meaning of *as* is *as* (*as*) and the *so* which has arisen in High German from *sta* or *stē* means both *as* and *so* &c. The case relations however which are expressed by *as* and *so* are genuine instrumentals† [C Ed p 100]. The Anglo Saxon form for *as* is *st* in which the colouring of the Zend *as* *lha* is most truly preserved. The Gothic *sta* *so* is according to its form only the abbreviation of *stē* as *a* is the short equivalent both of *ē* and of *ō* through this abbreviation however *sta* has become identical with its theme just as *as* *ana* in Zend is according to § 155 not distinguished from its theme.

160 †As the dative in Gothic and in Old High German very frequently expresses the instrumental relation and the termination also of the dative is identical with the Sanskrit Zend instrumental character, shortened only, as in polysyllabic words in Zend it may be proper here to describe at the same time the formation of the German dative. In *a* bases it is in Gothic as in Zend identical with the theme and from *I ULFA* comes *ulfa* as *as* *lha* from *I LIIRKA*. Moreover there are some other remarkable datives which have preserved their duo length and answer to the monosyllabic instrumentals *thē* *stē* *as* which have been already explained viz *hiammē h*, *hiammē h* 'cuque and *anummē hun* *ulli* for *anammē-*

\* Grimm's conjectures regarding the forms *sta* and *stē* (III 43) appear to me untenable and an explanation of these forms without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zen I is impossible. More regarding this at the pronouns.

† If *as* is regarded as 'through which means in which manner or way' and 'so' as 'through this means, in this way' it is certain that among the eight cases of the Sanskrit language there is none which would be adapted in the relative and demonstrative to express 'as' and 'so'.

‡ The German dat sing is according to § 336 Rem 3 to be everywhere identified with the Sanskrit dative and so too the dat pl the *m* of which approaches as closely to the Sansk. *byas* I am *bus*, Lath *mus* as the instrumental termination *byas*, Lath *mus*.

*hun* (§ 66) \* Bases in *i* reject this vowel before the case-sign, hence *gast'-a* for *gasti-a* on the other hand, in the *u* bases the termination is suppressed, and the base-vowel receives the Guna hence *sunau*, which will have been pronounced originally *su-nav-a*, so that, after suppressing the termination, the *v* has again returned to its original vowel nature The form *sunav-a* would answer to the Vêda form प्राबहव-*â* *pra-bâhav-â*. In Zend, the bases which terminate with *i* and *u*, both in the instrumental and before most [G Ed p 191] of the other vowel terminations, assume Guna or not at pleasure. Thus we find in the Vend S. p 169, ब्रधव-*a* *bâzav-a*, "*brachio*," as analogous to प्राबहव-*â* (§ 57), on the other hand, p 408, *zanthua* from *zantu*, "the slaying," "killing" From *pan'snu*, "dust," we find, l c p 229, the form *pan'snû*, which Anquetil translates by "*par cette poussière*", and if the reading is correct, then *pan'snû*, in regard of the suppressed termination (compensation for which is made by lengthening the base vowel), would answer to the Gothic *sunau*

161 Bases ending with a consonant have lost, in German, the dative character hence, in Gothic, *fiyand*, *ahmin*, *brôthir* (§ 132), for *fiyand-a*, *ahmin-a*, *brôthir-a* † All feminines, too, must be pronounced to have lost the dative sign, paradoxical as it may appear to assert that the Gothic *gibai*, "*dono*," and *thizai*, "*huic*," *izai*, "*ei*," do not contain any dative inflexion, while we formerly believed the *ai* of *gibai* to be connected with the Sanskrit feminine dative

\* Here the appended particle has preserved the original length of the termination, as is the case in Zend in all instrumentals, if they are combined with *cha*, "and"

† The Old High German form *fatere* (for *fatera*), "*patri*," proceeds, as do the genitive *fatere-s*, and the accusative *fatera-n*, from a theme *FATERA*, extended by *a* The accusative *fatera-n*, however, is remarkable, because substantives, so early as in the Gothic, have lost the accusative sign, together with the final vowel of the base In Old High German a few other substantives and proper names follow the analogy of *FATERA*

character  $\text{दे दि}$  But as we have recognised in the masculine and neuter dative the Indo-Zend instrumental we could not except from the most urgent necessity betake ourselves to the Sanskrit dative for explanation of the Gothic feminine dative This necessity however, does not exist for *e g hiedai albae* from *HI LITŌ* from *HI LITA* may be deduced from the instrumental  $\text{सुल्लय-द, albā}$  from  $\text{श्रुत सुल्लद}$  by suppressing the termination, and changing the semi vowel to a vowel in the same manner as above *sunau* from *sunav-a* [G Ed p 10.] or as the fem *handau, manni*, from *handav-a* Analogous with *sunau, handau* are also the dative feminine bases and *e g anstai, gratiæ* has the same relation to its theme *ANSTI* that *handau* has to *HANDU*

162 In Old High German the forms *diu hiu* correspond to the Gothic instrumentals *thé hie* but authorities differ as to the mode of writing them,\* regarding which we shall say more under the pronouns The form *hiu* also, from a demonstrative base *HI* has been preserved in the compound *hiutu* for *hiu tagu* on this day, to day (see Grimm p 794) although the meaning is here properly locative The Gothic has for it the dative *himma daga* This termination *u* has maintained itself also in substantive and adjective bases masculine neut in *a* and *i* although it is only sparingly used and principally after the preposition *mit* (see Graff I c pp 110 111) *mit uortu* with a word from *WORTA* *mit cuatu* 'with good, from *CUATA* *mit gastu* 'with a guest from *ASTI* It is here important to remark that the instrumental in Sanskrit very frequently expresses *per se* the sociative relation We cannot, however for this reason look upon this *u* case as generically different from the common dative which we have already remarked is likewise of instrumental origin

\* With reference to their use with various prepositions we refer our readers to Graff's excellent treatise The Old High German Prepositions p 181, &c

and meaning. we rather regard the *u*\* as a corruption

[G Ed. p. 193] (although one of very ancient date) of *u*, just as in the neuter plural of pronouns and adjectives a *u* corresponds to the short *a* of the Gothic and the older cognate languages. In Lithuanian the *a* bases form their instrumental in *ù*, which is long, and in which the final vowel of the base has been melted down. That this *ù*, also, has arisen from a long *a*, and thus, *e g.* *dieuù* is akin to the Zend  $\text{𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀}$  *daēva*, “*deo*,” for  $\text{𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀}$  *daēvā*, appears to me the less doubtful, as also in the plural *dieuais* answers very surprisingly to  $\text{𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀}$  *daēvāis*,  $\text{देवैः}$  *dēvāis*. Moreover, in many other parts of grammar, also, the Lithuanian *ù* corresponds to the Sanskrit  $\text{अि}$  *ā*, *e g.* in the plural genitive. In feminine *a* bases, also, in Lithuanian, the vowel of the base is melted down with that of the termination, but its quality is not changed, as, *e g.* *rankà* “*manu*,” from *RANKĀ*. In all other bases *mi* stands as the termination, to which the plural instrumental termination *mis* has the same relation as, in Latin, *bis* to *bi* (*voBIS*, *tiBI*), and, according to § 63, I do not doubt that in both numbers the *m* has arisen from *b*.

163. The bases given in § 148. form, in the instrumental and in the Gothic, in the dative,

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUANIAN	GOthic
m	<i>viké-n-a</i> ,	<i>vēhrka</i> ,	<i>wilkù</i> ,	<i>vulfa</i>
f	<i>jihway-ā</i>	<i>hizvay-a</i> ,	<i>rankà</i> ,	<i>gibai</i>
m	<i>paty-ā</i> ,	<i>parthy-a</i> ,	<i>pati-mi</i> ,	<i>gast'-a</i>

\* Contrary to Grimm's opinion, I cannot let the instrumental *u* pass as long, even not to notice its derivation from a short *a*, for, first, it appears, according to Notker, in the pronominal forms *du*, &c. without a circumflex (other instrumentals of the kind do not occur in his works); secondly, like the short *a*, it is exchanged for *o* (§ 77), hence, *wio*, *weo*, with *wiu*, *wio-ih*, *huco-ih*, “*qualis*” (properly, “similar to whom”), thirdly, the length of this *u* cannot be deduced from the Gothic forms *thé*, *hvé*, *své*, because these, in all probability, owe the retention of their long vowel to their being monosyllabic (cf § 137)

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUANIAN	GOthic
f	<i>prity ā</i>	<i>āfritby a</i>	<i>avi mi</i>	<i>anstai</i>
f	<i>bhaviṣhyanty ā,</i>	<i>būṣhyainty a</i>		
m	<i>sunu n ā</i>	<i>pasv-a</i>	<i>sunu mi</i>	<i>sunau-</i>
f	<i>tanu-ā</i>	<i>tanv-a</i>		<i>handau</i>
f	<i>iadhv ā</i>			
m f	<i>gav-ā</i>	<i>gai a</i>		
f	<i>niv-ā,</i>			
f	<i>vāch-a</i>	<i>vāch a</i>		
m	<i>bharat ā</i>	<i>barent a</i>		<i>fiyand</i>
m	<i>ātman-ā</i>	<i>asman-a</i>		<i>ahmin</i>
n	<i>nāmn ā</i>	<i>nāman-a</i>		<i>namin</i>
m	<i>bhrātṛ ā</i>	<i>brāthr-a</i>		<i>brōthr</i>
f	<i>dūhtr a</i>	<i>dughdher a</i>		<i>dauhtr</i>
m	<i>dātr-ā</i>	<i>dāthr a</i>		
n	<i>vacas-ā</i>	<i>vacanh a</i>		

[G Ed p 101]

161 In Sanskrit and Zend *ā* is the sign of the dative which I have scarce any doubt originally belongs to the demonstrative base *ē* whence the nom *अयम् ayam* (from *e+am*) this which however as it appears is itself only an extension of the base *ay a* from which arise most of the cases of this pronoun (*a smai a smāt a smin &c*) and regarding which it is to be observed that the common *a* bases also in Sanskrit in many cases extend this vowel to *ē* by the admixture of *m* 2 (§ 2) The dative sign consequently would in its origin be most intimately connected with the case which as (§ 160) was explained denotes in German both the dative and instrumental relation and occurs in Zend also with a dative signification \*

\* *E g* Vend S p 45 *Haomo a i anāititis dadhātī crato puthrōm*, He(m) gives a splendid daughter to those who have not had offspring The lithographed Codex however, gives the form *a i anāitibis* as three word

𐬀𐬵𐬀



[G Ed p 195] We have here further to remark, that in the pronoun of the 2d person the affix भ्यम् *bhyam* (from *bhi* + *am*) in तुभ्यम् *tu-bhyam*, "to thee," stands in evident relationship to the instrumental भिस् *bhis* in the plural. The feminine bases in *ā*, *i*, *ū*, and, at will also, those in *i* and *u*, prolong in Sanskrit the dative termination ए *ē* to ऐ *ai*, with the final *ā* of the base an *i* is blended; hence निह्वयै *nihwāy-ai* from *niwāi-ai*. On the other hand, इ *i* and उ *u* receive the Guna augment before ए *ē*, but not before the broader ऐ *ai*, as सूनावे *sūnav-ē* from *sūnu*. In Zend, feminine *ā* and *i*-bases, like the Sanskrit, have *ai* for their termination however, *hizvāy-ai* is not used, but *hizvay-ai*, from the base *hizvā*, as long vowels in the penultimate, in polysyllabic bases, are so frequently shortened. Bases in *i* have, in combination with the particle चा *cha*, preserved the Sanskrit form most truly, and exhibit, without exception in this case, the form *ay-aē-cha* (see § 28), e g. *karstayaēcha*, "and on account of the ploughing," "in order to plough" (Vend. S p 198),

[G Ed p 196] from *karste*. Without *cha*, however, the form *xe ē* is almost the sole one that occurs, e g. *kharēte*, "in order to eat," from *lharēti*. This form, I doubt not, has arisen from *ay-ē*, by rejecting the semi-vowel, after which the preceding *a* has become *xe* (§ 31). Forms like *āfrīte* or *āfrīte*, which sometimes occur, and are most corrupted, may

*azī zānāti bis* Such separations in the middle of a word are, however, in this Codex, quite common. I entertain no doubt of the correctness of the length of the *a*, both of *zā* and *nāi*, and I anticipate a variety *azīzanātibis* or—*bis*. Probably also *csaētō* is to be read for *csūtō*. Anquetil translates "O Hom, donnez à la femme, qui n'a pas encore engendré, beaucoup d'enfans brillans." We will return to this passage hereafter, and we will here further remark that, at the same page of the Vend S, the inst. *āebis* also occurs in the sense of "to them"

\* Cf. p 286 Note †

rest on errors in writing.\* Bases in *u* may take Guna e.g. *vanhu* pure or not as *rathu* from *ratu* great loud The form without Guna is the more common A euphonic *y* also is found interposed between the base and the termination (§ 43) e.g. *lanu-y* *corpori*

165 Bases in *a* add to the case-sign *é* also an *a* but from *ṛ é* (= *a + i*) and *a* is formed *aya*, and this with the *a* of the base gives *āya* thus *vrīkāya* Hence may have arisen by suppressing the final *a* the Zendian *vehrkādi* after which the preceding semi vowel must return to its vowel nature It might however be assumed that the Zend has never added an *a* to the dative *é* and that this is a later appearance in Sanskrit which arose after the division of languages for from *a + e* is formed quite regularly *ai* (§ 2) The Sanskrit forms also from the particle *smā* which is added to pronouns of the 3d person the dative *smāi*, and thus e.g. *hasmāi* to whom? answers to the Zend *lahmai* The Sanskrit, in this case abstains from adding the *a* which is elsewhere appended to the dative *ṛ é* since *smā* already encumbered with the preceding principal pronoun cannot admit any superfluity in its termination and for this reason gives up its radi [G Ed p 197] *cal* *a* before the termination *in* in the locative case also and forms *sm in* for *smén*

166 The particle *smā* mentioned in the preceding section which introduces itself between the base and the termination not only in the singular but (and thus in fact occurs in pronouns of the two first persons) in the plural also if not separated from both—as I have first attempted to shew

\* *afrite* is undoubtedly incorrect however *é* is often found erroneously for *ṛ é* in other forms also

in my Sanskrit Grammar—gives to the pronominal declension the appearance of greater peculiarity than it in fact possesses. As this particle recurs also in the cognate European languages, and there, as I have already elsewhere partly shewn, solves several enigmas of declension, we will therefore here, at its first appearance, pursue all its modifications and corruptions, as far as it is possible. In Zend, *sma*, according to § 53, has been changed to *hma*, and also in Prâkrit and Pâli, in the plural of the two first persons, the *s* has become *h*, and besides, by transposition of the two consonants, the syllable *hma* has been altered to *mha*, e.g. Prâkrit अहं *amhê*, “we” (ἄμμες), Pâli अहं *amhâkam*, Zend 𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬨𐬀 *ahmâkēm*, ἡμῶν. From the Prâkrit-Pâli *mha* we arrive at the Gothic *nsa* in *u-nsa-ra*, ἡμῶν, *u-nsi-s*,\* “nobis,” “nos.” In that the Gothic has left the sibilant unaltered, it stands on an older footing than the Pâli and Prâkrit, and on the other hand, by the change of *m* into *n*, for more facile combination with the following *s*, it rests on a more modern stage. We cannot, therefore, any longer assume the *ns* of *uns*, “nos,” to be

[G Ed p 198] the common accusative termination, as we have formerly done in unison with Grimm† cf. *vulfa-ns*, *gasti-ns*, *sunu-ns* and thence allow it, as though it had become a property of the base, to enter into some other cases, and connect it with new case-terminations. To this is opposed; also, the 2d person, where *izvis* (*i-zvi-s*) stands in the accusative, and yet in essentials the two persons are identical in their declension, *uns*, “nobis,” “nos,” stands, therefore, for *unsi-s* (from *unsa-s*), and this has *s* as the case-suffix, and *u-nsa* (weakened from *u-nsi*) as the compound base. And we

\* The *a* being changed into *i*, according to r 67

† I 813 “*unsara* appears to be derived from the accusative *uns*, as also the dative *unsi-s*, which, with *izvis*, preserves a parallel sound to the dative singular.” Cf I 813 34

cannot also any longer regard the *u* of *unsa-ra nostri* &c as the vocalized *v* of *veis* we although the *i* of *izvara vestri*" &c can be nothing else than the vocalized *y* of *yus* your for in Sanskrit also the syllable यु *yu* of *yūyam* ye (§ 43) goes through all the oblique cases while in the 1st person the व् *v* of वयम् *vayam* we is limited to the nominative but the oblique cases combine a base *va* with the particle स्म *sma*. This *a* then in Gothic through the influence of the following liquid has become *u* hence *unsa ra* &c for *ans ara* (§ 66)

167 As in Zend the Sanskrit possessive स्म *sma* shews itself\* in very different forms in juxta position with different letters so I believe I can point out the particle स्म *sma* in Gothic at least under four forms namely as *nsa zva gla* and *mma*. The first has been already discussed the second—*zla* and in a weakened form *vi*—occurs in the pronoun of the 2d person in the place where the 1st has *nsa* (*nsi*) and while in the cognate Asiatic languages (Sanskrit Zend Pali Prakrit) as also in Greek and Lithuanian the two pronouns run quite [G Ed p 199] parallel in the plural since they both exhibit the interposed particle under discussion either in its original form or similarly modified in Gothic a discrepancy has arisen between the two persons in that the syllable *sma* has in them been doubly transformed. The form *zla* from *sma* rests first on the not surprising change of the *s* into *z* (§ 86 5) secondly on the very common change of *m* and *v* (§ 63)

168 From the Gothic downwards the particle *sma* has been still further corrupted in the German dialects in the pronoun of the 2d person by the expulsion of the sibilant. The Old High German *i wa r* has nearly the same relation to the Gothic *i zla ra* that the Homeric genitive τοῖο has

\* See Ann of Lit Crit March 1831 p 316 &c

to the Sanskrit तस्य *tasya*, which is older than the Homeric form. Compare, without intervention of the Gothic, the Old High German *i-ua-r*, *i-u*, *i-wi-h*, with the Sanskrit *yu-shmâ-kam*, *yu-shmâ-bhyam*, *yu-shmâ-n*, and with the Lithuanian *yû-sû*, *yû-mus*, *yû-s*—thus it would be regarded as settled, that the *w* or *u* belongs to the base, but is not the corrupted remainder of a far-extended intermediate pronoun, and it would be incorrect to divide *iu-aī*, *iu-ih*, *iu*, for *i-ua-r*, &c. I, too, formerly entertained that erroneous opinion. A repeated examination, and the enlarged views since then obtained through the Zend, Prâkrit, and Pâli, leave me thoroughly convinced, that the Gothic intermediate syllable *zva* has not been lost in High German, but that one portion of it has been preserved even to our time (*e-ue-r* from *i-zva-ra*, *e-u-ih* from *i-zvi-s*, Old High German *i-wi-h*)—on the other hand, the *u* of the base *yu* (यु *yu*), as in Gothic so also in the oldest form of the High [G Ed p 200] German, is rejected in the oblique cases, both in the plural and in the dual\*, and the Gothic *i zva-ra*, Old High German *i-ua-r*, &c., stand for *yu-zva-ra*, *yu-wa-r*. The Old Saxon, however, and Anglo-Saxon, like the Lithuanian, shew themselves, in respect to the preservation of the base, more complete than the Gothic, and carry the *u*, which in Anglo-Saxon has become *o*, through all the oblique cases *iu-we-r*, *eo-ve-r*, “*vestri*,” &c. If merely the two historical extremes of the forms here under discussion—the Sanskrit and New German forms be contrasted with one another, the assertion must appear very paradoxical, that *euer* and युष्मिन् *yushmîkam* are connected, and, indeed, in such wise, that the *u* of *euer* has nothing

\* So much the more remarkable is the *u*, which is still retained in the North Friesian dialect (Grimm, p 814), where, *e g yu nhe-r*, *yu-nh*, in regard to the base, distinguishes itself advantageously from the Gothic

*i-ggva-īa*, *i-ngvi-s*.

in common with the *u* of *यु यु* but finds its origin in the *m* of the syllable *स्म sma*

169 The distinction of the dual and plural in the oblique cases of the two first persons is not organic in German, for the two plural numbers are distinguished originally only by the case-terminations. These however in our pronouns are in Gothic the same and the difference between the two plural numbers appears to lie in the base—*ugla ra* \* *νῶν unsa-ra ημῶν ιγq a-ra σφῶν ιζta ra υμῶν*. But from a more close analysis of the forms in the two plural numbers and from the light afforded us by the cognate Asiatic languages it appears that the proper base is also identical in the two plural numbers and it is only the particle *sma* combined with it which has become doubly corrupted and then the one form has become fixed in the dual the other in the plural. The former comes nearest to [G Ed p 201] the Prakrit Pali form *स्म mha* and between *u nsa ra* and *u gla ra* (= *u nka ra*) an intervening *u-nha ra* or *u-mha ra* must be assumed. At least I do not think that the old *s* became *k* at one spring but that the latter is a hardened form of an earlier *h* which has remained in the Prakrit and Pali, as in the singular nominative the *k* of *ik* has been developed from the *h* of *अहम् aham*. The second person gives in Gothic, *qv* (= *kv* § 86 1) for *k* while the other dialects leave the guttural the same form in both persons. Old High German *u ncha r*, *i ncha r*. Old Slavonic *u nke-r*, *i nke r*. Anglo Saxon *u nce-r* *i nce-r*. It would consequently appear proved that the dual and plural of the two first persons are not organically or originally different but be long as distortions and mutilations of different kinds to one and the same original form and that therefore these two pronouns have preserved the old dual just as little as

\* It must not be overlooked that *h-re g* before *k* only represents the nasal answering to *k* (§ 86 1)

the other pronouns and all substantive and adjective declensions

170 The fourth form in which ~~स्म~~ *sma* appears in Gothic is that which I first remarked, and which I have brought forward already in the "Annals of Oriental Literature" (p. 16) What I have there said, that the datives singular, like *thamma*, *imma*, have arisen, by assimilation, from *thasma*, *i-sma*, I have since found remarkably confirmed by the Grammar of the Old Prussian published by Vater, a language which is nearly connected with the Lithuanian and Gothic, since here all pronouns of the third person have *smu* in the dative. Compare, *e.g.* *antar-smu* with the Gothic *anthara-mma*, "to the other" *ka-smu* with the Gothic *hva-mma*, "to whom?" We have also shewn in Greek, since then, a remnant of the appended pronoun ~~स्म~~ *sma* similar to the Gothic, and which rests on assimilation,

[G Ed p 202] since we deduced the Æolic forms  $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\mu\mu\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\upsilon\text{-}\mu\mu\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$ , &c, from  $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\sigma\mu\epsilon\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\upsilon\text{-}\sigma\mu\epsilon\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$ , to which the common forms  $\eta\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ,  $\upsilon\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ , have the same relation that the Old High German *de-mu* has to the Gothic *tha-mma*, only that  $\eta\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ,  $\upsilon\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ , in respect to the termination *εῖς*, are more perfect than the Æolic forms, since they have not lost the vowel of the particle *σμε*, but have contracted *με-ες* to *μεις*.

171. The Gothic datives in *mma* are, as follows from § 160, by origin, instrumentals, although the particle *sma* in Sanskrit has not made its way into these cases, and *e.g.*  $\text{तस्मै}$  *tēna*, "through him," not *tasmēna*, or, according to the Zend principle (§. 158), *tasma* (for *tasmā*), is used, I say, according to the Zend principle, for though in this

\* The difference between the forms *thē*, *hvē*, explained at § 159, and the datives *tha-mma*, *hva-mma*, consists first in this, that the latter express the case relation by the affixed particle, the former in the main base, secondly, in this, that *thamma*, *hvamma*, for *thammē*, *hvammē*, on account of their being polysyllabic, have not preserved the original length of the termination (cf § 137)

language *hma* has entered into the instrumental masculine and neuter this case in the base *ta* could only be *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *tahmo* or *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *tohmā* (from *ta hma d*) In the feminine as we can sufficiently prove the appended pronoun really occurs in the instrumental and while *e g* from the masculine and neuter base *𐬀𐬢𐬀* *ano* this (m) this (n) we have found the instrumental of the same sound *𐬀𐬢𐬀* *ana* not *onohmo* from the demonstrative base *𐬀* *a* occurs rather often the feminine instrumental *𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀* *ohmy a* from the fem base *𐬀𐬭𐬀* *ohmi* increased by the appended pronoun

172 The Sanskrit appended pronoun [G Ed p 203] *स्मा* *sma* should, in the feminine form either *स्मा* *smd* or *स्मि* *smi* on the latter is based the Zend form *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *hmi* mentioned at § 171 But in Sanskrit the feminine form *स्मि* *smi* has been preserved only in such a mutilated condition \* that before my acquaintance with the Zend I could not recognise it From *ta smi* must come the dative *ta smy-ai* the gen and ablative *ta smy ds* and the locative *ta smy-am* These forms, by rejecting the *m* have become abbreviated to *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *to sy ai* *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *ta sy ds* *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *ta sy am*, and the same is the case with the feminine pronoun *smi* in all similar compounds so that the forms mentioned appear to have proceeded from the masculine and neuter genitive *tosyo* by the annexation of new case terminations This opinion was the more to be relied on that in Gothic also the feminine forms *thi zos* *huzus*"

\* The Zend too has not everywhere so fully preserved the feminine *lou* as in the instr *a hmy a* but in the genitive dative and ablative has gone even farther than the Sanskrit in the demolition of this word and has therein rejected not only the *m* but also the *i* The feminine *𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀* *a nh ai* (§ 56) '*huzus* for *a hmy ai* often occurs and for it also *𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀* *ainh ao* in which the *i* is to use the expression a reflection of the lost *𐬀𐬢𐬀* *y* (§ 41) From another demonstrative base we find the dative *𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀* *ava nh ai* and more than once the ablative *𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀* *ai a nh ai* for *ai a hmy ai* *ava l my ai*



*thi-zai*, "*huic*," might be deduced from the masculine genitive *this*, by the addition of the terminations *ós* and *ai*, and as, too, in Lithuanian, the whole of the oblique cases singular of the 1st and 2d person stand in close connection with the Sanskrit-Zend genitives मम *mama*, मज्ज *mana*, तव *tava*, तव्य *tava*, and have the same as base. After discovering the Zend fe-

[G Ed p 204] minine pronominal forms in *hmy-a* in the instrumental and locative in the latter for *hmy-anm* the above-mentioned forms in Sanskrit cannot be regarded otherwise than as abbreviations of *ta-smý-āi*, &c, as this is far more suited to the nature of the thing. The Gothic forms then, *thizós*, *thizai*, will be regarded as abbreviated, and must be divided into *thi-zó-s*, *thi-zai*. The masculine and neuter appended pronoun *smá* must, for instance, in Gothic give the feminine base  $SM\bar{O} = स्म स्मā$ , as *BLINDŌ*, nom. *blindā*, "*cæca*," from *BLINDA*, m n (nom *blind'-s*, *blindā-ta*)  $SM\bar{O}$ , however, by the loss of the *m*, as experienced by the Sanskrit in the feminine, has become  $S\bar{O}$ , but the *s*, on account of its position between two vowels (according to §. 86. 5.), has become *z*. Therefore, *thi-zó-s* has only *s* as case-sign, and the dative *thi-zai*, like *gibai* in § 161, is without case character. With the masculine and neuter genitive *thi-s*, therefore, *thi-zó-s*, *thi-zai*, have nothing in common but the demonstrative theme *THA*, and the weakening of its *a* to *i* (§ 66)

173 Gothic adjective bases in *a* (Grimm's strong adjectives) which follow the pronominal declension, differ from it, however, in this point, that they do not weaken the final *a* of the base before the appended pronoun to *i*, but extend it to *ai*, and form the feminine dative from the simple theme, according to the analogy of the substantives † hence *blindai-zó-s*, *blindai*, not *blindi-zó-s*, *blindi-zai*

\* Cf § 356 Rem 3 p 501 last line but seven

† With respect to the extension of the *a* to *ai*, compare the gen pl and Sanskrit forms, as *tē-bhyas*, "*us*," *tēshām*, "*eorum*," for *ta-bhyas*, *ta sām*

171 The Zend introduces our pronominal syllable *ma* in the form of *hma* also into the second and probably into the first person too we find repeatedly in the locative, *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *thura hm* : instead of the Sanskrit [G Ed p 200] *तृयि* *tray* : and hence deduce in the 1st person *ma him* : which we cannot quote as occurring. The Prakrit in this respect follows the analogy of the Zend and in the 2d person gives the form *𑀧𑀸𑀲𑀺𑀓* *tuma sm* : "in thee" or with assimilation *𑀧𑀸𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓* *tumamini* with *𑀧𑀸𑀲𑀺* *tumē* (from *tuma* : ) and *𑀧𑀸𑀲𑀺* *ta* : and *𑀧𑀸𑀲𑀺𑀓* *mama sm* : or *𑀧𑀸𑀲𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺𑀓* *mama mini* in me together with the simple *𑀧𑀸𑀲𑀺* *maē* and *𑀧𑀸𑀲𑀺𑀓* *mai* \* Ought not therefore in German also in the singular of the two first persons a remnant of the pronominal syllable *ma* to be looked for? The *s* in the Gothic *mi s* to me *thu s* to thee" and *si s* to himself appears to me in no other way intelligible for in our Indo-European family of languages there exists no *s* as the suffix of the instrumental or dative. Of similar origin is the *s* in the plural *u ni s nobis* "nos" : *ti s vobis* "vos" and its appearance in two otherwise differently denoted cases cannot therefore be surprising because this *s* is neither the dative nor accusative character, but belongs to a syllable which could be declined through all cases but is here deprived of all case sign. In *u ni s* : *ti s* therefore the Sanskrit *स्म* *ma* is doubly continued once as the base and next as the apparent case suffix. I am inclined also to affirm of the above mentioned Prakrit forms *tu ma sm* : in thee and *ma ma sm* : "in me" that they doubly contain the pronominal syllable *ma* and that the middle syllable has dropped a preceding *s*. For there is no more favourite and facile combination in our class of languages than of a pronoun with a pronoun and what is omitted by one dialect in this respect is often afterwards supplied by another more modern dialect.



[G. Ed p. 206.] 175. The *h* in the Gothic accusatives *mi-h*, *thu-h*, *si-h* (*me*, *te*, *se*), may be deduced, as above, in *u-gla-ra*, *u-wi-h*, &c, from *s*, by the hardening of an intervening *h*, so that *mi-s* is altered to *mi-h*, and thence to *mi-k*, and therefore, in the singular, as also in the plural, the dative and accusative of the two first persons are, in their origin, identical. In Old High German and Anglo-Saxon our particle appears in the accusative singular and plural in the same form. Old High German *mi-h* "me," *di-h*, "thee," *u-ni-h*, "us," *i-wi-h*, "you", Anglo-Saxon *me-c*, "me," *u-si-c*, "us," *the-c*, "thee," *eo-u-c*, "you". on the other hand, in the dative singular the old *s* of the syllable *sma* has become *r* in the High German, but has disappeared in the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon. Old High German *mi-r*, *di-r*, Old Saxon *mi*, *thi*, Anglo-Saxon *me*, *the*.

176. In Lithuanian *esma* appears in the same form as in the middle of the above-mentioned (§ 171) Piâkîit forms, namely, with *s* dropped, as *ma*, and indeed, first, in the dative and locative sing of the pronouns of the 3d person and adjectives, and, secondly, in the genitive dual of the two first persons. we cannot, however, refer to this the *m*, which the latter in some cases have in common with the substantive declension. The pronominal base *TA*, and the adjective base *GERA*, form, in the dative, *tú-mui*, "to thee," *gerú-mui*, "to the good" (shortened *túm*, *gerúm*), and in the locative *ta-mè*, *gera-mè*, and if *-mui* and *-mè* are compared with the corresponding cases of the substantive *a* bases, it is easily seen that *mui* and *mè* have sprung from *ma*. The pronouns of the two first persons form, in the genitive dual, *mu-mû*, *yu-mû*, according to the analogy of *ponû*, "of the two lords."

\* We have a remnant of a more perfect form of the particle *esma* in the locative interrogative form *ka-mmè*, "where"? Sansk कस्मिन् *kā-smîn*, "in

177 Lithuanian substantives have *i* for [G Ed p 207] the dative character but *i* bases have *ei*\* a final *a* before this *i* passes into *u* hence *vilku i*. Although we must refuse a place in the locative to the dative *i* of the Greek and Latin still this Lithuanian dative character appears connected with the Indo Zead *ē* so that only the last element of this diphthong which has grown out of *a+i* has been left. For the Lithuanian has besides the dative also a real locative which indeed in the *a* bases corresponds exactly with the Sanskrit and Zead

178 The nominal bases Sanskrit Zend and Lithuanian explained at § 148 excepting the neuters ending with *a* vowel and pronouns to the full declension of which we shall return hereafter form in the dative

	SAN KRIT	ZEND	LITHUANIAN
m	<i>irikaṃya</i>	<i>iehrkaui</i>	<i>vilku i</i>
f	<i>jihvaṃya ai</i>	<i>hiziay ai</i>	<i>ranka i</i>
m	<i>paty e†</i>	<i>paite ē?†</i>	<i>pači ei</i>
f	<i>prīṇaya e</i>	<i>afrīte e</i>	<i>auči ei</i>
f	<i>bhaviṣhyanti-ai</i>	<i>bushyainty-ai</i>	
m	<i>sūnau ē,</i>	<i>pasv-e</i>	<i>sunu i</i>

in whom which according to the common declension would be कस्मै *kasmē* (from *kasma i*) Compare the Gothic *kamma* to whom? for *i kasma*

\* The form *auči* with *ai* appears to admit of being explained as arising from the commixture of the final vowel of the *a* bases

† The form पतये *patyē* is with respect to its want of Guna irregular and should be पतये *patayē*

‡ In combination with अच् *cha* we find in V S p 473 अच्ये-cha and hence deduce for the instrumental (p 193 G Ed) the form *paṭhya* while according to § 47 also *paṭja* might be expected. From अच्ये *haci* friend I find in V S p 167 the instrumental अच्ये *hacaya* with Guna after the analogy of the अवा *bā* *ava* mentioned at § 160

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUANIAN.
[G. Ed p 208]	f. <i>tanav-ê,</i>	<i>tanu-y-ê,</i> *	.
	f. <i>vadhv-â,</i>	.	.
	m. f. <i>gav-ê,</i>	<i>gav-ê,</i>	.
	f. <i>nâv-ê,</i>	.	.
	f. <i>vâch-ê,</i>	<i>vâch-ê,</i>	.
	m. <i>bharat-ê,</i>	<i>barēnt-ê,</i>	.
	m. <i>âtman-ê,</i>	<i>ašman-ê,</i>	.
	n. <i>nâmn-ê</i> †	<i>nâman-ê,</i>	.
	m. <i>bhrâti-ê,</i>	<i>brâthr-ê,</i>	.
	f. <i>duhit-ê,</i>	<i>dughdhēr-ê,</i> †	.
	m. <i>dâti-e,</i>	<i>dâthr-ê,</i>	.
	n. <i>vachas-ê,</i> †	<i>vachanh-ê,</i>	.

\* I give 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 *tanuyê* with euphonic *y*, because I have found this form frequently, which, however, cannot, for this reason, be considered as peculiar to the feminine, and, instead of it, also *tanvê* and *tanavê* may be regarded as equally correct. Cf § 43, where, however, it is necessary to observe, that the insertion of a euphonic 𐬀 *y* between *u* and *ê* is not everywhere necessary, and, for instance, in the dative is the more rare form.

† The 𐬭 in 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 *dughdhêrê*, and in the instr. 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *dughdhêra*, is placed there merely to avoid the harsh combination of three consonants. I deduce these forms from the plural genitive 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *dughdhêr anm*, for 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *dughdhêr-anm*.

‡ Respecting 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 *nâmnê*, for 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 *nâmanê*, and so in the instrumental 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 *nâmnâ*, for 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 *nâmanâ*, see § 140. In Zend, in this and similar words, I have not met with the rejection of the *a* in the weakest cases (§ 130), but examples of its retention, *e g* in the compound *aocô-nâman*, whence the genitive *aocô-nâmanô* (Vend S p 4, and frequently). I consider the initial *a* in this compound as the negation, without euphonic *n*, for in all probability it means "having untold (countless) names." Similar compounds precede, viz 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *hazam ô-ghaôshahê baêvarê-chashmanô*, "of the thousand eared, ten thousand eyed." Cf Anquetil II 82. In words in *van*, on the other hand, *a* is rejected in the weakest cases, and then the 𐬀 *v* becomes 𐬀 *u* or 𐬀 *o*. Regarding the addition of the 𐬀 *i* in 𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀 *nâmanê*, see § 41.

ABLATIVE

179 The Ablative in Sanskrit has  $\pi t$  [G Ed p 209] for its character regarding the origin of which there can no longer be any uncertainty as soon as the influence of pronouns on the formation of cases has been recognised as we are conducted at once to the demonstrative base  $ta$  which already in the neuter nominative and accusative has assumed the nature of a case sign and which we shall subsequently under the verb see receiving the function of a personal termination. This ablative character however has remained only in bases in  $\pi a$  which is lengthened before it, a circumstance that induced the Indian Grammarians who have been followed by the English to represent  $\pi a t$  as the ablative termination. It would therefore be to be assumed that in  $\pi a t$  the  $a$  of the base has been melted down with the  $t$  of the termination \*

180 M E Burnouff† has been the first [G Ed p 10] to bring home the ablative character to a class of words in Zend which had lost it in Sanskrit and whence it can be satisfactorily inferred that a simple  $t$  and not  $dt$  is the true ablative character. We mean the declension in  $u$  of which hereafter. As regards bases in  $a$  which in Sanskrit alone have preserved the ablative we have to observe that in

\* I have drawn attention already in the first (German) edition of my Sanskrit Grammar to the arbitrary and unfounded nature of this assumption (§§ 166 and 264) and I have deduced from the allatives of the pronouns of the two first persons ( $mat$   $tucat$ ) that either  $at$  with short  $a$  or more correctly, a simple  $t$  must be regarded as the allative termination. This view I supported in the Latin edition of my Grammar on the ground that in old Latin also a simple  $d$  appears as the suffix of the ablative. But since then the justness of my opinion regarding the Sanskrit ablative has been still more emphatically confirmed by the Zend language because the Zend stands in a closer and more evident connection with the Sanskrit than does the Latin.

† Nouveau Journal Asiatique 1838 tom III 311



that in *a* does the ablative more frequently occur although these words are in number but five or six the ablative use of which is very frequent e.g. *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *ddonhaot* creation from *ddonhu* in a passage explained elsewhere.<sup>\*</sup> *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *anhab-t* 'mundo' from *anhu*, *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *tanab-t* corpore from *tanu*. Bises ending with consonants are just as little able to annex the [G L I p 212] ablative *at* without the intervention of another letter as the accusative is to annex *m* without an intermediate letter and they have *at* as their termination numerous examples of which occur e.g. *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *at* *agud* *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *at* *igne* *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *chashman at* *oculo* *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *ndonhan at* *nuso* *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *drug at* *demone* *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *vis at* *loco* (cf *vicus* according to § 21) Owing to the facile interchange of the *a* with *ā* *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *at* is sometimes erroneously written for *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *at* this Vendidul S p 339 *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *sabchant at* for *နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *inbchant at* *lucente* Bises in *u* sometimes follow the

by the Sanskrit form *abrot*, for which the irregular form *abrat* it is used and secondly, it answers to the 1st per *mraum* (V S p 123) thirdly the Sanskrit *at* is in Zend never represented by *ao* but by *at*, before which according to § 28 another *a* is placed hence *at* on the other hand *ao* represents *u* in accordance with § 32 and § 28 If then *pasu* formed in the ablative *pasu* thus would conduct us to a Sanskrit *pasu* while from the ablatives *fritoi* *aratusroi* *garoi* and from the analogy in other respects with the genitive the Guna form *pa o t* must be deduced Moreover in the Vend S the ablative form *at* actually occurs for at p 102 (*နိမ္မိတသမ္ဘာ* *hacha* *anleat* *mananh at* 'from puro spirit') occurs *anleat* the ablative of *anhu* and the *e* preceding the *a* is an error in orthography and *anhab-t* is the form intended p 45 occurs *anhab-t* 'mundo' from *anhu*

\* Gramm Crit § 640 anu 2



consonantal declension in having *𐬀𐬎* *at* as the ablative termination instead of a mere *t*, just as in the genitive, besides a simple *s*, they exhibit also an *ō* (from *as*, § 56<sup>b</sup>), although more rarely. Thus, for the above-mentioned *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *tanavot*, "corpore," occurs also *tanv-at* (Vend S. p. 492)\*. Feminine bases in *𐬎𐬀* *ā* and *𐬎𐬀* *i* have *𐬀𐬎* *āt* in the ablative, as an analogous form to the feminine genitive termination *𐬀𐬎𐬌* *ās*, whence, in the Zend *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *daō*, *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *daḥmay-āt*, "praecleara," from *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *daḥmā*, *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *urvaray-āt* "aurea," from *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *urvarā*, *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *bairethry-āt*, "genitrice," from *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *bairethri*†.

The feminine bases also in *u*, and perhaps also those in *i*, may share this feminine termination *𐬀𐬎* *āt*, thus, from *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *zantu*, "begetting," comes the ablative *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *zanthu-āt* (cf. Gramm Crit. §. 610. Rem 2.) Although, then, the ablative has been sufficiently shewn to belong to all declensions in Zend, and the ablative relation is also, for the most part, denoted by the actual ablative, still the genitive not unfrequently occurs in the place of the ablative, and even adjectives in the genitive in construction with substantives in the ablative. Thus we read, Vend S. p. 479, *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *hacha* *avanhāt*‡ *visat yat māzdayasñōis*, "ex hac terrā quidem mazdayasniā."

\* Burnouf writes *tanavat*, probably according to another Codex. I hold both forms to be correct, the rather as in the genitive, also, both *tanv-ō* and *tanav-ō* occur, and in general, before all terminations beginning with a vowel, both the simple form and that with Guna are possible.

† Vendidad Sade, p. 436 *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀* *Yatha vehrkō chathvarē-jangi ō mshdarēdayāt bairethryat hacha puthrēm*, "As a wolf, a four-footed animal, tears a child from its mother." This sentence is also important as an example of the intensive form (cf. Gramm Crit § 363). The Codex, however, divides incorrectly *mshdarē dayāt*.

‡ Regarding this form, see p. 172 Rem.

181 The Old Roman corresponds with the Zend in regard to the designation of the ablative and in those two memorials of the language that on the *Columa rostrata* and the *S C de Bacchanalibus* which are the most important inscriptions that remain all ablatives end with *d* so that it is surprising that the ablative force of this letter could be overlooked and that the empty name of a praeagogic *d* could be held satisfactory. Bases ending with a consonant use *ed* as ablative suffix as in the accusative they have *em* instead of a simple *m* hence forms like *praesent ed dictator ed* answer to the Zend *saōchant at āthr at* (*lucente igne*) while *navale-d\* praeda d malo d mari d senatu d* like the above mentioned Zend forms *garōi t monte garōi t corpore &c* and in Sanskrit *irihā t lupō* have a simple *T* sound to denote the ablative. The Oscan also takes the ablative sign *d* through all declensions as appears from the remarkable inscription of Bantina *e g dolu d* [G Ed p 214] *mallu-d cum prenatu d touta d presentu d†*. It may be preliminarily observed that in the 3d person of the imperative old Latin and Oscan forms like *es tod es tud*—for *es-to* and therefore with a double designation of person—correspond remarkably to similar Vedic forms with which we are hitherto acquainted only from Panini *e g jivātāt* which signifies both *live!* and *live* but in the latter sense is probably only an error in the use of the language (cf *vivito* as 3d and 2d person).

182 In classical Latinity a kind of petrified ablative form appears to be contained in the appended pronoun *me* which may be transferred from the 1st person to the others also and answers to the Sanskrit ablative *mat* from me. But it is possible also that *me* may have

\* The *e* here belongs to the base which alternates between *e* and *i*

† See O Muller's *Inscriptions* p 36

dropped an initial *s*, and may stand for *smet*, and so belong to the appended pronoun स्म *sma*, explained in § 165 &c, corresponding with its ablative *smât*, to which it stands in the same relation that *memor* (for *mesmor*) does to स्मृ *smr* from स्मृ *smr*, § 1 “to remember” The combination of this syllable, then, with pronouns of the three persons, would require no excuse, for स्म *sma*, as has been shewn, unites itself to all persons, though it must itself be regarded as a pronoun of the 3d person.\* The conjunction *sed*, too, is certainly nothing but the ablative of the reflexive, and *sed* occurs twice in the *S. C. de Bacch.* as an evident pronoun, and, in fact, governed by *inter*, [G Ed. p 215] whence it may be assumed that *inter* can be used in construction with the ablative, or also that, in the old languages, the accusative is the same with the ablative the latter view is confirmed by the accusative use of *ted* and *med* in Plautus

† 183. In Sanskrit the ablative expresses distance from a place, the relation “whence,” and this is the true, original destination of this case, to which the Latin remained constant in the names of towns. From the relation “whence,” however, the ablative is, in Sanskrit, transferred to the causal relation also, since that on account of which any thing is done is regarded as the place whence an action proceeds In this manner the confines of the ablative and instrumental touch one another, and तेन *tēna* (§ 158) and तस्मात् *tasmât*, may both express “on account of which” In adverbial use the ablative spreads still further, and in some words denotes relations, which are otherwise foreign to the ablative. In Greek, adverbs in *ως* may be looked upon as sister forms of the Sanskrit ablative, so that *ως*, from bases in *o*, would have the same relation to the Sanskrit

\* The reduplication in *me-mor*, from *me-smr*, would be of the kind used in Sanskrit, e g *pasparśa*, “he touched,” of which hereafter

† Cf the Gothic ablatives in *ô*, adduced in § 294 Rem 1 p 384



## THE GENITIVE

[G Ed p 217] 184 In no case do the different members of the Sanskrit family of languages agree so fully as in the genitive singular, only that in Latin the two first declensions, together with the fifth, as well as the two first persons of the pronouns, have lost their old termination, and have replaced it by that of the old locative. The Sanskrit terminations of the genitive are स् *s*, स्य *syā*, अस् *as*, and आस् *ās* the three first are common to the three genders *as* is

member has a genuine ablative meaning, and as the division ἀφρο-δίτην admits of no satisfactory explanation, one may rest satisfied with ἀφροδ-ίτην. In Sanskrit, अभ्रादिनी *abhrāditā* would mean "the female who proceeded from a cloud," for *abnrā-t* must become *abhrād* before *itā* (§ 93.); and in neuter verbs the otherwise passive participial suffix *ta* has usually a past active meaning. Of this usage ऐτη in ἀφροδ-ίτην, might be a remnant, and this compound might mean, therefore, "She who arose, who sprang, from foam." The only difficulty here is the short vowel of οδ for ωδ. As regards the Sanskrit, here also the *s* of the ablative may in most declensions rest on an exchange with an older *t* (cf p 184 G ed Note), and, as the Zend gives us every reason to expect Sanskrit ablatives like *jihwāy-āt*, *prītē-t*, *sūnō-t*, *bhavishyanty-āt*, *ātman at*, so it will be most natural to refer the existing forms *jihwāy-ās*, *prītē-s*, &c, where they have an ablative meaning, to the exchange of *t* with *s*, which is more or less in vogue according to the variety of dialects, particularly as it is known, also, that, *vice versā*, according to certain laws, स् *s* passes into त् *t* (Gramm. Crit § 100). Consequently the identity between the genitive and ablative, in most declensions, would be only external, and the two cases would vary in their history, so that, e g *jihwāy-ās* would be, in one sense, viz in that of *linguæ*, independent and original, and in another, that of *linguâ*, a corruption of *jihwāy āt*. At the time when Sanskrit and Zend were separated from one another, the retention of the original *t* must have been the prevailing inclination, and, together with it, may also its change into *s* have arisen, as the Zend also uses, at times, the genitive form with an ablative meaning (e g Vend S p 177)

principally confined to the consonantal bases \* and hence has the same relation to *s* that in the accusative *am* has to *m* and in the Zend ablative *at* has to *t*

185 Before the genitive sign *ञ्* the [C. E. p. 118] vowels *इ* *i* and *उ* *u* take Guna and the Zend and in a more limited degree also the Lithuanian and Gothic share this augment. All *u* bases for example in Lithuanian and Gothic prefix an *a* to their final vowel hence the Lithuanian *sunau s* and Gothic *sunau s* correspond to the Sanskrit *सुनोः sunoḥ* (*filii*) from *sunau* (§ 2). In the *i* bases in Gothic Guna is restricted to the feminines thus *anslai s* *gratīe* answers to *मन्ये प्रीतेः*. Respecting Lithuanian genitives of *i* bases see § 193. The High German has from the earliest period dropped the genitive sign in all feminines in consonantal bases (§§ 125 127) the sign of the genitive is wanting in the other genders also.

186 The form which the Sanskrit genitive termination after consonants assumes as it were of necessity (§ 94) viz *as* for *s* has in Greek in the form *ος* passed over also to the vowels *i* and *u* and diphthongs terminating in *u* and genitives like *πορτιος* *εχθυος* which would be in accordance with § 185 are unheard of but *πορτιος* *εχθυος* answer like *पदोः* to Sanskrit genitives of consonantal bases as *पदम् padas* *पदिस padis* *वाचम् vāch as* *वोचis*. The Latin on the other hand answers more to the other sister languages, but is without Guna so *hostis* is like the Gothic genitive *gasti s*. In the *u* bases (fourth declension) the lengthening of the *u* may replace the Guna or more correctly this class of words followed the Greek or consonantal principle and the vowel dropped before *s* was compensated for by

\* Besides this it occurs only in monosyllabic bases in *इः ऊः ऐः* *ai* and *औः* *eu* e.g. *राय as* *'rai* *नदी as* *naḥis* and in neutrals in *इः* and *उः* which by the assumption of an euphonic *ञ् n* assimilate to the consonantal declension in most cases.

[G Ed p 219] as than from the Greek *os*, because the old Sanskrit *a* in other places in Latin has been weakened to *i*, as frequently happens in Gothic (§§ 66. 67).

187. With regard to the *senatu-os* just mentioned, it is important to remark, that, in Zend also, the *u* bases, instead of annexing a simple *s* in the genitive, as 𐬨𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬔𐬌𐬎𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵 *mamyēu-s*, "of the spirit," from *mamyu*, may, after the manner of consonantal bases, add 𐬱 𐬰 (from *as*, cf p 212, G Ed), as 𐬨𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬔𐬌𐬎𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬱𐬰 *danhv-ō*, or 𐬱𐬰𐬨𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬔𐬌𐬎𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬱𐬰 *danhav-ō*, for *danheu-s* "*loci*," from 𐬨𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬔𐬌𐬎𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵 *danhv*. This kind of genitive occurs very frequently as a substitute for the locative, as also for the ablative (Vend. S p. 157), more rarely with a genuine genitive meaning."

188 Bases in अ *a*, and pronouns of the third person, of which only *omu* ends with a vowel other than *a*, have, in Sanskrit, the more full genitive sign स्य *sya*, hence, *e. g.* वृकस्य *vr̥ka-sya*, “*lupi*,” तस्य *ta-sya*, “*huyus*,” &c, अमुष्य *amu-shya*,

\* It might be assumed that as βασιλέος clearly stands for βασιλέ<sup>ς</sup>ος, βοός for βο<sup>ς</sup>ός, νᾱός for νᾱ<sup>ς</sup>ός, (§ 124), so also ἄσ<sup>ς</sup>τεος would stand for ἄσ<sup>ς</sup>τε<sup>ς</sup>ος, and that ἄσ<sup>ς</sup>τεος, therefore, should be compared with the Zend genitives with Guna, as *𑬒𑬀𑬛𑬩𑬭𑬀* *danhav-ō*. The ε, therefore, in ἄσ<sup>ς</sup>τεος would not be a corrupted υ of the base, but the Guna vowel foreign to the base, but the υ of the base, which, according to the original law of sound, must become F before vowels, is, like all other digammas in the actual condition of the language, suppressed. The ε is certainly a very heterogeneous vowel to the υ, and the corruption of the latter to ε, in the middle of a word, would be a greater violation of the old relations of sound than the rejection of a υ sound between two vowels. The corruption of *ī* to *ě* is less surprising, and occurs also in Old High German (§ 72). In Greek, also, a consonant *y* is wanting, but cannot have been originally deficient, and therefore the question might be mooted whether also *πόλεως*, *σινάπεος* may not stand for *pole-yōs*, *sinape-yos*.





190 In Lithuanian the genitives of the *a* bases differ remarkably from those of the other declensions, and denote the case by *o*, in which vowel, at the same time, the final vowel of the base is contained, thus, *vilk-o*, "lupī," for *vilk-a-s*. It is probable that this *o* (*ō*) has arisen from *a-s*, according to a contraction similar to that in the Zend (§ 164.) In old Slavonic, also, *o* occurs, answering to the Sanskrit *as*, and *nebo*, gen. *nebes-e*, corresponds to the Sanskrit नभस् *nabhas*. That, however, the Lithuanian has left the syllable *as* in the nominative unaltered, but in the genitive has contracted it to *o*, may induce the remark, that like corruptions do not always find entrance in like places, if they have not raised themselves to a pervading law. In this manner, in Gothic, the old *a* has remained in the interrogative base *HTA* in the nominative (*hvas*), but in the genitive *hvi-s* the weakening to *i* has taken place; so that here, as in Lithuanian, only the more worthy powerful nominative has preserved the older more powerful form, and an unorganic difference has found its way into the two cases, which ought to be similar.

191. The Gothic has no more than the Lithuanian preserved a remnant of the more full genitive termination *sy-a*, and the Gothic *a* bases, in this case, resemble the *i* bases, because *a* before final *s* has, according to § 67, become weakened to *i*, thus *vulfi-s* for *vulfa-s*; as also in Old Saxon the corresponding declension exhibits *a-s* together with *e-s*, although more rarely, thus, *daga-s*, "of the day,"

[G. Ed. p. 222.] answering to the Gothic *dagi-s*. The consonantal bases have, in Gothic, likewise a simple *s* for case-sign, hence, *ahmin-s*, *fiyand-s*, *brōthr-s* (§ 132.) The older sister dialects lead us to conjecture that originally an *a*, more lately an *i*, preceded this *s* *ahmin-as*, *fiyand-as*, *brōthr-as*,—which, as in the nominative of the *a* bases (*vulfi-s* for *vulfa-s*), has been suppressed. The Zend exhibits in the *r* roots an agreement with the Gothic, and forms, *e g* *𐬀𐬀𐬎* *nar-s*, "of

the man" not *mano* probably on account of the nature of the *r* bordering, on that of a vowel and of its facile combination with *r* \*

197 Feminines in Sanskrit have a fuller genitive termination in bases ending with a vowel, viz. *-ā* for simple *s* (see § 113) and in fact so that the [G 1 p 22] short ending bases in *a* and *i* may use at will either simple *s* or *-ā*, and instead of *-ā* the *-ī* also occurs. The long vowels *e* & *i* have always *-ā*, hence *śāntā* *śāntī* *śānty-ā*. This termination *-ā* is in *Zeṃt* according to § 9 sounded *le*, hence *śāntāngā* *śāntī* *śānty-ā*. In bases in *a* and *i* have not met

[illegible]

† Only the few monosyllabic words make an exception (Crumm (1977: 100)).

with this termination, together with  $\alpha\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\upsilon$  *áfrítô-s*,  $\alpha\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\upsilon$  *taneu-s*, or  $\phi\gg\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\upsilon$  *tanu-ô*,  $\phi\gg\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\upsilon$  *tanu-ô*, I find no  $\alpha\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\upsilon$  *áfrítth-ô*,  $\alpha\phi\gg\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\upsilon$  *tanu-ô*. The cognate European languages exhibit no stronger termination in the feminine than in the masculine and neuter; the Gothic, however, shews a disposition to greater fulness in the feminine genitive, inasmuch as the *ô* bases preserve this vowel in contradistinction to the nominative and accusative; but the *z* bases, as has been shewn above, attach Guna to this vowel, while the masculines do not strengthen it at all. Compare *gibô-s* with the uninflected and base-abbreviated nominative and accusative *giba*, and *anstai-s* with *gasti-s*. Respecting the pronominal and adjective genitives, as *thi-zô-s*, *blindai-zô-s*, see § 172. The Greek, also, in its feminine first declension preserves the original vowel length in words which have weakened the nominative and accusative— $\sigma\phi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ ,  $\text{Μούσης}$ ,

[G Ed. p 224] opposed to  $\sigma\phi\hat{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}$ ,  $\sigma\phi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ,  $\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$  \* In Latin, also, *ā-s*, with the original length of the base *escās*, *teriās*, &c stands opposed to *escā*, *escā-m*. It cannot be supposed that these genitives are borrowed from the Greek, they are exactly what might be expected to belong to a language that has *s* for the genitive character. That, however, this form, which no doubt extended originally to all *a* bases, gradually disappeared, leaving nothing but a few remains, and that the language availed itself of other helps, is in accordance with the usual fate of languages which continually lose more and more of their old hereditary possessions.

193. The Lithuanian, in its genitive *rank-ô-s* for *rankâ-s*,

\* The Attic termination *ωs* is, perhaps, a perfect transmission of the Sanskrit  $\alpha\iota\varsigma$  *ās*, so that forms like  $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\text{-}\omega\varsigma$  answer to  $\text{प्रिय}\alpha\iota\varsigma$  *prity ās*. Although the Greek *ωs* is not limited to the feminine, it is nevertheless excluded from the neuter ( $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ), and the preponderating number of *z* bases are feminine.

resembles the Gothic, and in some other cases also replaces the feminine  $\bar{a}$  by  $\gamma$  long or short  $o$ . It is doubtful how the genitives of  $\gamma$  bases like *auēs* are to be regarded. As they are, for the most part feminine and the few masculines may have followed the analogy of the prevailing gender the division *auēs* might be made and this might be derived through the assimilative force of the  $\gamma$  from *auīds* (cf p 174 note\*) which would answer to the Sanskrit genitives like *पुत्रस्य पुत्र्यस्य*. If however it be compared with *पुत्रस्य पुत्र्यस्य* and the  $\bar{e}$  of *auīds* be looked upon as Guna of the  $\gamma$  (§ 26) then the reading *auīds* for *auēs* is objectionable. Ruhig indeed in his Glossary frequently leaves out the  $\gamma$  and gives *ugnēs* of the fire for *ugnēs* but in other cases also an  $\gamma$  is suppressed before the  $e$  generated by its influence (p 171 note\*) and e.g. all feminine bases in  $\gamma\bar{u}$  have in the genitive *es* for  $\gamma\bar{e}s$  or  $\gamma\bar{u}\bar{e}s$  as *giesmes* for *giesmyēs* from *GIESM\bar{y}\bar{e}* (see p 169 note). Therefore the division *auīds* might also be made and it might be assumed that the  $\gamma$  bases have in some cases, experienced an extension of the base similar to those which were explained in the note p 174 (cf § 120). This view appears to me the most correct especially as in the vocative also *auīds* answers to *giesme* for *giesmye* or *giesmie*.

194 As regards the origin of the form through which in the genitive the thing designated is personified with the secondary notion of the relation of space the language, in this case returns back to the same pronoun whence in § 134 the nominative was derived. And there is a pronoun for the fuller termination also viz *स्य sya* which occurs only in the Vedas (cf § 55) and the  $s$  of which is replaced in the oblique cases likewise as in the neuter by  $t$  (Gramm Crit § 268) so that *स्य sya* stands in the same relation to *तन् त्या m* and *तत् त्या t* that *स sa* does to *तम् ta m* *तत् ta t*. It is evident therefore that in *स्य sya* *त त्या* the bases *स sa* *त ta* are continued with the vowel suppressed and united

with the relative base  $\pi ya$  Here follows a general view of the genitive formation<sup>1</sup>

	SANSKRIT	SLAV	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOTHIC
m.	<i>vr̥ka-sya</i> ,	<i>vĕhri ku-hĕ</i> ,	<i>λύκο-ιο</i> ,	. . .	<i>wilkō</i> ,	<i>wulfi-s</i> .
m	<i>la-sya</i> ,	<i>la-hĕ</i> ,	. . .	<i>cu-rius</i> ,	<i>kō</i> ,	<i>hvi-s</i>
f	<i>grihu-āy-ās</i> ,	<i>hrievay-āo</i> ,	<i>χώρᾱ-s</i> ,	<i>ter rā-s</i> ,	<i>rankō-s</i> ,	<i>gibō-s</i> .
m	<i>patē-s</i> ,	<i>patōi-s</i> ,	. .	<i>hosti-s</i> ,	.	† <i>gasti-s</i> .
	<i>paty-us</i> ,	. .	<i>πόσι-ος</i> ,	. .	. . . . .	. . . . .
f	<i>pr̥itē-s</i> ,	<i>āfrītōi-s</i> ,	. .	<i>siti-s</i> ,	. .	† <i>anstar-s</i> .
	<i>pr̥ity-ās</i> ,	.	<i>φύσε-ως</i> ,	. . . .	.	. . . .
f.	<i>bhaviṣhyanty-ās</i> ,	<i>būṣhyantiy āo</i> ,	. .	.	ṡ. .	. . .
m.	<i>sūnō-s</i> ,	<i>pašeu-s</i> ,	. . . .	. .	<i>sunau-s</i> ,	<i>sunau-s</i> .
	. .	<i>pašv-ō</i> ,	<i>ἰχθύ-ος</i> ,	.	. . . .	. . . .
[G. Ld p. 226] f.	<i>tanō-s</i> ,	<i>taneu-s</i> ,	. .	<i>soci ū-s</i> ,	. . . .	<i>handau-s</i> .
	<i>tanv-ās</i> ,	<i>tanv-ō</i> ,	<i>πίτυ-ος</i> ,	.	. .	. . .
f	<i>radhu-ās</i> ,	. .	. .	. . . .	.	. . . .
m f.	<i>gō-s</i> ,	<i>geu-s</i> ,	<i>βο(F)-ός</i> ,	<i>bov-is</i> ,	.	. . . .
f.	<i>nāv-as</i> ,	.	<i>να(F)-ός</i> ,	. . .	.	. . . .
f	<i>vāch-as</i> ,	<i>vāch-ō, †</i>	<i>ὄπ-ός</i> ,	<i>voc-is</i> ,	. . . .	. . . .
m	<i>bharat-as</i> ,	<i>barēnt-ō, §</i>	<i>φέρωντ-ος</i> ,	<i>ferent-is</i> ,	. .	<i>fiyand-is</i> .
m	<i>ātman-as</i> ,	<i>aśman-ō, †</i>	<i>δαίμων-ος</i> ,	<i>ser mon-is</i> ,	<i>ākmen-s</i> ,	<i>ahmin-s</i>
n	<i>nāman-as</i> ,	<i>nāman-ō, †</i>	<i>τάλαν-ος</i> ,	<i>nomi-n-is</i> ,	. .	<i>namin-s</i> .

<sup>1</sup> The meanings will be found in § 148

† See § 193

‡ See p. 163 Note †

§ And  $\beta\rho\alpha\tau\acute{o}$ , *baratō* also may occur, according to the analogy of  $\beta\rho\upsilon\zeta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$  *bērēzatō*, "splendens," V S p. 87, and *passim*. The retention of the nasal in the genitive, however, as in all other cases, is the more common form, and can be abundantly quoted. For  $\beta\rho\alpha\tau\acute{o}$ , *baratō*, also  $\beta\rho\alpha\tau\acute{o}$ , *barantō*, is possible, and likewise, in the other cases, the older  $\alpha\alpha$  or  $\epsilon\epsilon$ . In some participles, as in  $\alpha\gamma\rho\upsilon\gamma\alpha\upsilon\delta$  *agryyauδ* (nom.), which is of constant recurrence as the usual epithet of agriculture ( $\alpha\gamma\rho\upsilon\gamma\alpha\upsilon\delta$  *agryyauδ*)  $\epsilon\epsilon$  never occurs.

|| Vile i. 251 p. 302, Note †

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOTHIC.
m	<i>bhr̥t̥ur</i>	<i>brāt̥ar</i> § 4	πατρ-ος	<i>fratr̥ is</i>		<i>brothr-s</i>
f	<i>dūhtur</i>	<i>dughdhar</i> § †	θυγατρ-ος	<i>matr̥ is</i>	<i>duhter s</i>	<i>dauht̥r-s</i>
m	<i>dāt̥ur</i>	<i>dāt̥ar</i> §	δοτ̥ήρ ος	<i>dator̥ is</i>		
n	<i>vachas as</i>	<i>vachanh</i> § ‡	ἐπε(σ) ος	<i>oper̥ is</i>		

## THE LOCATIVE

195 This case has in Sanskrit and Zend § 1 for its character and in Greek and Latin || has received the function of the dative yet has not suffered its locative [G Ed p 27] \* signification to be lost hence Δωδῶνι, Μαραθῶνι, Σαλαμῖνι, ἀγρῶ οἰκοῖ χαμαὶ and transferred to time τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτὶ. So in Sanskrit दिवसे दिवसे in the day " निशि निशि in the night

196 With *wa* of the base preceding it the locative § 1 passes into *wa* (§ 2) exactly as in Zend but here also *wa* stands for *wa* (§ 33) so that in this the Zend approaches very closely to the Greek datives like οἴκοι, μοι and σοι in which *i* has not yet become subscribed or been replaced by the extinction of the base vowel. To the forms mentioned answers *maudhyōi* in the middle. One must be careful not to regard this and similar phenomena as shewing a more intimate connexion between Greek and Zend.

197 In Lithuanian which language possesses a proper locative bases in *a* correspond in this case in a remarkable manner with the Sanskrit and Zend since they con-

\* It would be better to read *brothr o* after the analogy of *dāt̥r creatoris* (Burnouf Yaçna, p 363, Note)

† The gen. of *dughdar* is probably *dughder o* (see p 194 Note †)

‡ See p 163 Note ‡

§ Few cases admit of being more abundantly quoted in Zend than the locative with which, nevertheless Rask appears to have been unacquainted at the time of publishing his treatise, as he does not give it in any of his three paradigms

|| I now refer the Latin dative to the Sanskrit dative rather than to the locative, see § 192, G Ed Note †

tract this *a* with the old locative *i*, which appears pure nowhere any more, to *ê*, hence, *dicuê*, "in God," from *DIEWA*, answers to देवे *dêiê*, *दुःखस्य दुःखê*. The bases which terminate with other vowels employ, however, in Lithuanian, without exception, *ye* as the locative termination, without any accent upon the *e*, a circumstance which must not be overlooked. This *e* is, perhaps, only an unorganic echo, which has occasioned the change of the old locative *i* into *y*, as, in Zend, the plural locative termination *su*, by adding an *a*, appears, for the most part, in the form of *सुअ*

[G Ed p 228] *shva*, or *सुअ hva*. To the Lithuanian *ye* answers also, in old Slavonic, a locative termination *ye*, for which several declensions have the original pure *i*, so that *nebes-i*, "in Heaven," and *imen-i*, "in the name," agree most strictly with the Sanskrit नभसि *nabhas-i* and नानि *nâman-i*, from नभस् *nabhas*, नामन् *nâman*.

198 Masculine bases in *i* and *u*, and, optionally, feminine bases also, have a different locative termination in Sanskrit, *औ du*, before which इ *i* and उ *u* are dropped, but in पति *pati*, "lord," and सहि *sahi*, "friend," the *i* has remained in its euphonic change to य *y* hence, पतौ *paty-âu* सहौ *sahy-âu*. If we consider the vocalization of the *s* to *u*, shewn in § 56<sup>b</sup>, and that, in all probability, in the dual, also, औ *âu* has proceeded from आस् *âs* (§ 206), moreover, the circumstance that in the Vêdas the genitive occurs with a locative meaning (दक्षिणायाम् *dakshinâyâs*, "in dexterâ," for दक्षिणायाम् *dakshinâyâm*, Pânni VII 1. 39), and, finally, the fact that, in Zend, masculines in *i* and *u* likewise employ genitive terminations with a locative signification, we shall be much disposed to recognise in this औ *âu*, from आस् *âs*, a sort of Attic or produced genitive termination.

199 In *u* bases, instead of the locative the Zend usually employs the genitive termination *ê* *ô* (from अस् *as*), while, in a genitive meaning, the form *सुस* *eu-s* is more common, thus we read, in the Vend S p 337., *अस्तामि अन्वê यत अस्तामि*, "in

*hoc mundo quidem existente* This Zend termination *o* (from *u + u*) has the same relation to the Sanskrit *du* that a short *a* has to a long *a* and the two locative terminations are distinguished only by the quantity of the first member of the diphthong. On the other hand we find in the feminine base *tanu* "body" very often the genuine locative form *tanu :* and we do not doubt that in Sanskrit also originally the *u* bases of the [G 1d p 290] three genders admitted in the locative the termination *u* (सुवि *sunu* : तन्वि *tanu* : मध्वि *madhu* : or मधुनि *madhu n* :). Bases in *u* employ in the locative the usual genitive termination *u* : thus in the Vend S p 231 *ahm namānē yat mā-dayasnois* in *haec terra quidem ma-dayasnoica* which Auguetil renders by *dans le pays des ma-deiesnans*. In pronouns also though they have a locative the genitive sometimes occurs with a locative meaning e.g. Vend S p 16 *ainhē risē* in this way or place (cf. the feminine form *ainhao* § 172 Note).

200 From the Zend and Sanskrit we have already been compelled to acknowledge a connexion between the genitive and locative and as we have seen the locative replaced by the genitive so must we in Latin recognise a replacing of the genitive by the locative. Through the formal agreement of the corresponding Latin and Sanskrit termination and from the circumstance that the genitive occurs with a locative meaning only in the two first declensions (*Roma Corinthi hūm*) not in the third or in the plural (*ruri* not *ruris*) M Prof Rosen was first induced to characterize the Latin genitive of the two first declensions as borrowed from the old locative in view the correctness of which I do not doubt and which I have already corroborated elsewhere by the genitives of the two first persons, in which *metui* agree most surprisingly with *मयि mayi* (from *mē* : § 2) in *me* त्वयि *tvayi* (from *tvē* :). Or ought perhaps a double inflexion *i* to be assumed as the sign of both a genitive and



a locative dative? Should *Romæ* (from *Romæ*), *Corinthi*, be on one occasion genitives and on another locatives, and

[G Ed. p 230.] in their different meaning be also of different origin? And where, then, would the origin of the genitive *Romæ* be found, as that of the locative has been found already? Should *mei*, *tui*, be compared, not with मयि *mayi*, त्वयि *twayi*, μοί, τοί, but with मम *mama*, त्व *twā*, μοι, τοι; Goth *meina*, *thaina*? As the cases, like their substitutes the prepositions, pass easily from one relation of space to another, and, to use the expression, the highest become the lowest, nothing appears to me more probable, than that, after the first declension had lost its *ā*-s, then the dative, according to its origin a locative, necessarily became substituted for the genitive also. In the second declension the form *o-i*, which belongs to the dative locative, corresponding to the Greek *ω*, *οι* and of which examples still remain handed down to us (as *populoi Romanoī*) has become doubly altered either the vowel of the base alone, or only that

[G Ed p 231] of the termination, has been left, and the first form has fixed itself in the dative, and the latter in the

‘ The assumption that a rejected *s* lies at the base of the genitives in *i*, *ae* (*a-i*) appears to me inadmissible, because in all other parts of Grammar—numerous as the forms with a final *s* otherwise are—this letter has in Roman defied all the assaults of time, and appears everywhere where the cognate languages lead us to expect it no *terræ* for *terras* (acc pl), no *lupi* for *lupos*, no *amæ* for *amas*, &c. The question is not here that of an occasional suppression of the *s* in old poets, before a consonant in the word following. The genitives in *e-s* and *æ-s* occurring in inscriptions (*provincie-s*, *suæ-s*, see Struve, p 7) appear to be different modes of writing one and the same form, which corresponds to the Greek *η-s* for *ā-s*, and I would not therefore derive the common genitive *suæ*—older form *suai*—from *suæs* with the *s* dropped. The genitives in *us*, given by Hantung (p 161) from inscriptions in Orelli (*nomin-us*, *exercitu-us*, *Castor-us*, &c), I am not surprised at, for this reason, that generally *us* is, in Latin, a favourite termination for अस *as*, hence *nomin-us* has the same relation to नास *nāmn-as*, that *nomin-i-bus* has to नासभ्यस *nāma'-bhyas*, and *lupus* to वृकस् *vṛka-s*

genitive which is therefore similar to the nom plural, where in like manner *Romani* stands for *Romanoi*. But the dative is not universally represented in Latin by a locative termination for in the pronouns of the two first persons *mihi* answers to मयि *ma-hyam* from *ma bhyam* and *tibi* to त्वयि *tvā bhyam* as however the league between the dative and locative had been once concluded this truly dative termination occurs with a locative meaning (*tibi ubi*) while *vice versa* in Sanskrit the locative very frequently supplies the place of the dative which latter however is most usually expressed by the genitive so that the proper dative is for the most part applied to denote the causal relation

201 Pronouns of the 3d person have in Sanskrit इन् *in* instead of *i* in the locative and the च *a* of the appended pronoun स्म *sma* is elided (see § 165) hence तस्मिन् *tasm in* in him कस्मिन् *kasm in* in whom? This *n* which seems to me to be of later origin as it were an *εφελακυστικον* does not extend to the two first persons and is wanting in Zend also in those of the third hence अस्मि *ahmi* in this As to the origin of the *i* signifying the place or time of continuance it is easily discovered as soon as *i* is found as the root of a demonstrative which however like the true form of all other pronominal roots has escaped the Indian Grammarians

202 Feminine bases ending with long simple vowels have in Sanskrit a peculiar locative termination viz स्म *am* in which also the feminines in short *i* and *u* may at will participate (cf § 192) while the monosyllabic feminine bases in long ई *i* and ऊ *u* for स्म *am* admit also the common इ *i* hence भियाम् *bhuy am* or भियि *bhuy i* in fear from भी *bhi* \* In Zend this term [G Ld p 32]

\* Perhaps the termination *am* is a corruption of the feminine genitive termination *as* (cf § 108 दक्षिणायाम *dakṣiṇāyam* is for *dakṣiṇājam*) where it should be observed that in Prakrit, as in Greek, a final *s* has frequently become a nasal

nation *ām* has become abbreviated to *a* (cf. § 211), hence, *yahmy-a*, “in which,” from *yahmi* (cf. §. 172). This termination appears, however, in Zend. to be less diffused than in Sanskrit, and not to be applicable to feminines in *ṣ i* and *ṣ u*. The form *tanu* is clearly more genuine than the Sanskrit *tanū*, although from the earliest period, also, *tanvām* may have existed.

203 We here give a general view of the locative, and of the cases akin to it in Greek and Latin (see § 148).

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	ITHULIAN
	m <i>nikē,*</i>	<i>vīhrkē,*</i>	λύκω,	<i>lup'-ī,</i>	<i>nikē</i>
	f. <i>jihvāy-ām,</i>	<i>hizvay-a,</i>	χώρα,	<i>terra-i,</i>	<i>tanho-ye.</i>
	m <i>paty-āu,†</i>	. . .	πόσι-ι,	<i>hos'-ī,</i>	<i>patī-ye</i>
	f. <i>prū'-āu,‡</i>	. . .	πόρτι-ι,	<i>sit'-ī,</i>	<i>auri-ye.</i>
	f. <i>bhaviśhyanty-ām, bāśhyantya,</i>	. . .	. . .	. . .	. . .
	m <i>sūn'-āu,</i>	. . .	ἰχθύ-ι,	<i>pecu-ī,</i>	<i>sunu-ye</i>
	f. <i>tan'-āu,§</i>	<i>tanu-i,</i>	πίτυ-ι,	<i>sociu-ī,</i>	. . .
	n. <i>madhu-n-i,</i>	. . .	μέθυ-ι,	. . .	. . .
	f. <i>vadhv-ām,</i>	. . .	. . .	. . .	. . .
	m.f <i>gar-i,</i>	<i>gar-i,</i>	βο(φ)-ί,	<i>boi-ī,</i>	. . .
[G	f <i>nār-i,</i>	. . .	νᾱ(ῥ)-ί,	. . .	. . .
Ed.	m <i>bharat-i,</i>	<i>barēnt-i,</i>	φέρωντ-ι,	<i>ferent-ī,</i>	. . .
p	m <i>ātman-i,</i>	<i>āzmain-i,</i>	δαίμον-ι,	<i>seimon-ī,</i>	. . .
233	n. <i>nāmn-i,</i>	<i>nāmāin-i,</i>	τάλαν-ι,	<i>nomīn-ī,</i>	. . .
	m <i>bhrātai-i,</i>	<i>bīāthr-i ?</i>	πατρ-ί,	<i>fratr-ī,</i>	. . .
	f. <i>duhitar-i,</i>	<i>dughdhēr-i ?</i>	θυγατρ-ί,	<i>matr-ī,</i>	. . .
	m <i>dātar-i,</i>	<i>dāthr-i ?</i>	δοτήρ-ι,	<i>datōr-ī,</i>	. . .
	n. <i>vachas-i,</i>	<i>vacanh-i,</i>	ἐπε(σ)-ι,	<i>oper-ī,</i>	. . .

\* See § 196    † See § 198    ‡ On *prīty-ām*    § Or *tanu-ām*

|| The rejection of the *a* preceding the *i* in the theme seems to me more probable than its retention. The *i* of the termination is guaranteed by the other consonantal declension, which in this case we can abundantly enough exemplify. (Regarding *dughdhēr-i*, see p 194, Note †) That in Sanskrit *bhrātai-i*, *duhitar-i*, *dātai-i*, are used instead of *bhrāti*, &c. is contrary to

## VOCATIVE

204 The vocative in the Sanskrit family of languages has either no case sign at all or is identical with the nominative the former is the principle the latter the practical corruption and is limited in Sanskrit to monosyllabic bases terminating in a vowel hence भीष्म *bhis* 'fear!' as कृष् *krish* A final *a* of the nominal [G Ed p 234] bases remains in Sanskrit and Zend, unchanged, in Lithuanian it is weakened to *e* and the Greek and Latin also in the uninflected vocative of the corresponding declension prefer a short *e* to *o* or *u* which under the protection of the terminations appears as the final letter of the base We must avoid seeing in लुके *lupe* case terminations these forms have the same relation to वृक् *vr̥k* that πεντε *pen-te* have to पञ्च *pancha* and the old *a* which appears in लυκος as *o* in *lupus* as *u* has assumed the form of *e* without any letter following it In Zend the consonantal bases when they have *s* in the nominative retain it in the vocative also thus in the present participle we have frequently found the form of the nominative in the sense of the vocative

205 Bases in *i* and *u* have in Sanskrit Guna neuters however have also the pure vowel on the other hand

---

to the theory of the weakest cases (§ 130) to which in other respects the locative belongs As however bases in अर् *ar* (अृ *ri*) with respect to the rejection and lengthening of the *a* have a very great agreement with bases in *an* it must here be further remarked, that these too in the locative do not strictly follow the suppression of the *a* in the weakest cases which is conditionally prescribed in § 140 but optionally retain the *a* or reject it so that with नमन् *namn* also नāman *naman* is used With ब्रātar *brātar* however exists no *blarutr* and the form पितृ *pitṛ* given at § 10<sup>2</sup> is an oversight the Greek παρ *par* may therefore with respect to the shortening of the base, be better compared with the dative पितॄ *pitṛē*

\* The Zend can at will attach Guna to a final > u, or not; and we find both 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *marnyô* and 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *marnyu* as the vocative of 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *marnyu*, "spirit". On the other hand, we have found a final > i only, without Guna; and indeed frequently 𐬤𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *partî*, "lord". So Vend S p 456, 𐬤𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬪𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *ušihista namânô-partî*, "Arise, lord of the place!" The > i between the preposition and the verb serves as a conjunctive vowel, to assist the juncture of the words (cf. § 150 Note).

† It follows from this, and from § 193, that (§ 177) I have incorrectly assumed *ei* as the termination in the dative. For *áwi-ei*, the division should be made thus, *áwie-i*, and this is analogous with *zwáke-i*, *griesme-i*, for *zwákie-i*, *griesmie-i*.

into the vocative the nasal which had been dropped in the nominative. Adjectives in German with respect to the vocative have departed from the old path and retain the case sign of the nominative hence Gothic *blind's* blind! In Old Northern substantives also follow this irregular use of the nominative sign. The Greek has preserved a tolerable number of its vocatives pure from the nominative sign and in some classes of words uses the bare base or that abbreviation of it which the laws of euphony or effeminacy rendered requisite hence *ταλαν* opposed to *ταλας* *χαριεν* for *χαριειτ* opposed to *χαριεις* *παϊ* for *παιδ* opposed to *παῖς*. In guttural and labial bases the language has not got free of the nominative sign in the vocative because *κς* and *πς* (*ξ ψ*) are very favourite combinations to which the alphabet also has paid homage by particular letters to represent them. Still the [G Ed p 236] vocative *αια* together with *ἄναξ* is remarkable and has that sound which might be expected from a theme *ἄιακτ* to which, in its uninflected state neither *κτ* nor conveniently even the *κ* could be left. For the rest it is easy to imagine (says Buttmann p 180) that particularly such things as are not usually addressed prefer when they happen to be addressed to retain the form of the nominative as *ὦ ποῦς*! \* The Latin has followed still further the road of corruption in the vocative which was prepared by the Greek and employs in its place the nominative universally except in the masculine second declension. The substantive bases mentioned in § 148 form in the vocative

\* To this circumstance may also the re introduction of the case sign in the neuter be owing while the Sanskrit employs the bare base. More over this fact also may have co operated towards the Greek more easily freeing itself in the vocative from the bare primary form because it appears at the beginning of compounds much more rarely than in Sanskrit (See § 112)

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	HEBREW	GOthic
m.	<i>vr̥ika,</i>	<i>vēhka,</i>	λύκε,	<i>lūpe,</i>	<i>willē,</i>	<i>vulf</i>
n.	<i>dānu,</i>	<i>dāta,</i>	δῶρο-ν,	<i>donu-m,</i>	.	<i>dauī.</i>
f.	<i>ḡihwē,</i>	<i>hiwē?</i>	χώρα,	<i>terra,</i>	<i>ṛanka,</i>	<i>ḡiba?</i>
m.	<i>pātē,</i>	<i>paiti,</i>	πόσι,	<i>hosti-s,</i>	.. .	<i>ḡast.</i>
f.	<i>pr̥tē,</i>	<i>āfiṛti,</i>	πόρτι,	<i>siti-s,</i>	....	....
n.	<i>vāri,</i>	<i>vairi,</i>	ἴδρι,	<i>mare,</i>	....	...
f.	<i>bhaviṣhyanti,</i>	<i>bāshyanti,</i>	....	..	..	
m.	<i>sunō,</i>	<i>paśu,</i>	ἰχθύ,	<i>pecu-s,</i>	<i>sunai,</i>	<i>sunau</i>
f.	<i>tanō,</i>	<i>tanu,</i>	πίτυ,	<i>sociu-s,</i>		<i>handau</i>
[G. Ed p 237.] n.	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>madhu,</i>	μέθυ,	<i>pecu,</i>	.	.
f.	<i>vadhu,</i>		.	..	.	.
m. f	<i>ḡāu-s,</i>	<i>ḡāu-s,</i>	βοῦ,	<i>bo-s,</i>	..	.
f	<i>nāu-s,</i>	..	ναῦ,	.	..	.
f	<i>vālc,</i>	<i>vālc-s?</i>	ὄπ-ς,	<i>voi-s,</i>	.	
m	<i>bharan,</i>	<i>baran-s,</i>	φέρων,	<i>feren-s,</i>	<i>sukan-s,</i>	<i>ḡiyand.</i>
m.	<i>ātman,</i>	<i>aśman,</i>	δαίμον,	<i>sermo,</i>	<i>ākmū,</i>	<i>ahma.</i>
n.	<i>nāman,</i>	<i>nāman,</i>	τάλαν,	<i>nomen,</i>	.	<i>namō.</i>
m	<i>br̥rāt̥ar,</i>	<i>br̥āt̥arē,*</i>	πάτερ,	<i>frater,</i>	....	<i>br̥ōlhar</i>
f	<i>duh̥tar,</i>	<i>dug̥hdharē,*</i>	θύγατερ,	<i>mater,</i>	<i>mote,</i>	<i>dauhtar</i>
m	<i>dāt̥ar,</i>	<i>dāt̥are,</i>	δοτήρ,	<i>dator,</i>	.. .	.. .
n	<i>vachas,</i>	<i>vachō,</i>	ἔπος,†	<i>opus,</i>	.. .	.. .

## DUAL

## NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, VOCATIVE.

206 These three cases have, in Sanskrit, in the masculine and feminine, the termination *-āi āu*, which probably arose from *आस् ds* by vocalization of the *s* (cf §§ 56<sup>b</sup>. and 198), and is therefore only a stronger form of the plural termination *as*. The dual, both in the cases mentioned and in the others, prefers the broadest terminations, because it is based on a more precise intention than the indefinite

\* See § 44

† See § 128









have the less doubt, because in the other declensions the Lithuanian dual also agrees in this case most strictly with the Sanskrit, and the Lithuanian *u* or *û* (*uo*) is, in some other places, equally the representative of an old *ā* (see § 162), compare, *dūmi*, or *dūdu*, "I give," with दामि *dadāmi*, *dūsu*, "I will give," with दास्यामि *dāsyāmi*. And the monosyllabic pronominal bases also in *a* sound in the dual *û*, thus *tû* = तौ *tā*, *hû* = हौ. We hold, therefore, the Vêda form वृकौ *vikāu*, the Zend 𐬯𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬀 *vēhikā*, and the Lithuanian *wilkû*, as identical in principle. We are, at least, much more inclined to this view of the matter than to the assumption that the *u* of *wilkû* is the last portion of the Sanskrit diphthong औ *au*, and that *wilkû* belongs to the form वृकौ *vikāu*. In the vocative the Lithuanian employs a shorter *u*, and the accent falls on the preceding syllable thus *wilkū*, opposed to *wilkû*, in which respect may be compared पातरप opposed to पातरप, and § 205.

210 Masculine and feminine bases in *i* and *u* suppress, in Sanskrit, the dual case termination औ *au*, and, in compensation, lengthen the final vowel of the base in its uninflected form, thus, पति *patī*, from पति *pati*, सूनू *sūnū*, from सूनू *sūnu*. The 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *bāzuv-āo*, "arms," (from *bāzu*) mentioned in § 207., is advantageously distinguished from these abbreviated forms. The curtailed form is not, however, wanting in Zend also, and is even the one most in use. From 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *mainyu*, "spirit," we frequently find the dual 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *mainyû*. On the other hand, for 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ērēzû*, "two [G Ed p 242] fingers," we meet with the shortened form 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ērēzu*, which is identical with the theme (Vend S p 318, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *dva ērēzu*).

211 The Lithuanian, in its *i* and *u* bases, rests on the above-mentioned Sanskrit principle of the suppression of the termination and lengthening of the final vowel. Hence, *avû*, "two sheep" (fem), answers to अवि *avi*, from अवि *avi*; and *sunû*, "two sons," to सूनू *sūnū*. On this principle rests

also the Greek dual of the two first declensions. If it be not desired entirely to remove the  $\omega$  of  $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omega$  from a Grecian soil and banish it completely to India it may be allowed to seek its origin not in the long  $a$  of वृका *vrīkā* but in the short  $o$  of the base as the first declension has a long  $a$  in the dual because its bases terminate with  $\alpha$ , although in the common dialect this letter is very frequently represented by  $\eta$ . Or may it perhaps have happened that in the dual  $\alpha$  of the first declension an  $i$  subscribed has been lost, and thus  $\tau\alpha$  for  $\tau\alpha i$  would correspond to the Sanskrit ते *tē* (from  $tā + i$  or  $i$ )<sup>2</sup>. Be that as it may still the dual has always the quality  $\alpha$  because it is comprehended in the base and the  $\omega$  of  $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omega$  may be regarded as merely the lengthening of the  $o$  of  $\lambda\upsilon\kappa o$  for it must be assumed that if the Sanskrit  $a$  bases had preserved the short  $\alpha$  in Greek and वृक्त *vrīkta* had become  $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\alpha$  then the dual too would be  $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\alpha$ , and not  $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omega$ .

212 Neuters have in the Sanskrit dual for the termination of the cases under discussion not औ *au* but इ *i* as in the plural they have not  $as$  but short  $i$  (इ). A final  $\alpha$  of the base with this इ  $i$  passes into ए *ē* (§ 2) hence शते *sate* two hundred from शतइ *sata i*. [G Ed I 243] other vowels interpose a euphonic  $n$  hence तलुनी *talu n i* two pilates. In Zend I can quote the neuter dual only in the  $a$  bases as for example we frequently find सौत *sautē* (§ 11) answering to the Sanskrit शते *sate* and दुय *duyē*  $ha\text{-}antē$  two thousand (§ 43) for द्वे महसे *duē sahasrē*.

213 The Greek has renounced a termination distinguishing the neuter from the two natural genders but the Sanskrit appears to have extended the neuter  $i$  mentioned above also to the feminine  $a$  bases. But the coincidence of the feminine form निह्वे *jihvē* two tongues from निह्व *jihva* with the neuter दाने *dānē* two gifts is as the Zend instructs us only external and the two forms

meet in quite different ways, and have such a relation to one another, that in *dānē*, from *dāna*+*i*, a dual termination, and, in fact, the usual one of neuters, is actually contained, - but in *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 jihuē* the masculine-feminine termination *āu* (from *ās*, § 206.) is lost, but can, however, be again restored from the Zend form *𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 nāirikaṃ-āo*, "two women" I believe, that is to say, that *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 jihuē* has arisen or been corrupted from *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 jihuway-āu*\* in such a manner, that after the termination has been dropped, the preceding semi-vowel has returned to its vowel nature, and has become a diphthong with the *ū* of the base (see § 2. and cf. p. 121 G. ed.). The dual *jihwē*, therefore, like the Gothic singular dative *gibai* (§ 161.) would have only an apparent termination, i. e. an extension of the base which originally accompanied the real case termination. In Zend, however, the abbreviated feminine dual form in *𐬀 ē* likewise occurs (§ 207. Note†), and is, indeed, the prevalent one, but it is

[G. Ed p 244] remarkable, and a fair and powerful confirmation of my assertion, that even this abbreviated form in *𐬀 ē*, where the appended particle *𐬀𐬭𐬀 cha* stands beside it, has preserved the case sign *ś*, and, as above, *𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 amēretat-āos-cha*, "the two Amēritats," so we find, Vend. S p 58, *𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 amēshes-cha špēntē*, "and two Amshaspants" ("non-conniventesque sanctos," cf *𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 amisha* and Nalus V 25, 26 and see § 50) | The form *𐬀𐬀 ēs* is to be deduced from the full form *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 ay-āos*, so that, after dropping the *𐬀𐬀 āo*, the preceding *ay* must have been contracted to *ē*, just as (p 121

\* Cf the dual genitive and locative *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 jihuway-ās*

† The MS has here *𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 amēšescha*, but *ē* frequently occurs in the place of *𐬀*, although, as it appears, through an error Cf I c p 38, *𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 aorē yašnō amēšē špēntē*, and see § 51



	SANSKRIT	ZLND	GRIEK	IRRHANIAN
[G. Ed p 246]	m. <i>uikāu,</i>	<i>uēhrkāo,</i>	. .	.
	<i>uikā,</i>	<i>uēhrkā,*</i>	<i>λύκω,</i>	N. <i>uilkū,</i> V. <i>uilkū.</i>
n. <i>dānē,</i>		<i>dātē,</i>	<i>δώρω,</i>	.
f. . . .		<i>hēzvay-āo,</i>	. . .	. . .
	<i>gihvē,</i>	<i>hizvē,</i>	<i>χώρᾱ,</i>	N. <i>rankī,</i> V. <i>ránkī</i>
m. <i>paī,</i>		<i>pauī?</i>	<i>πόσι-c,</i>	N. <i>paī,</i> V. <i>pāi</i>
f. <i>paī,</i>		<i>āfī?</i>	<i>πόρτι-c,</i>	N. <i>auī,</i> N. <i>āui.</i>
n. <i>vīn-i,</i>		. . .	<i>ἰδρι-c,</i>	.

\* While consonantal bases occur in the dual both with a long and a short *a*, the *a* bases, contrary to the practice otherwise adopted of shortening a final *ā*, exhibit in the nom. acc. dual, for the most part, the original long vowel. I deduce this, among other words, from the so-called *Amshaspants*, which, together with the feminine form noticed at § 207 Note †, are found also as masculine, e.g. Vend S pp 14 30, 31, &c. *amēshā spēntā* *hucsatrā hudāonhō āylē,* "I glorify the two Amshaspants (non conniventesque sanctos) the good rulers, who created good." If *amēsha spēntā* and *hucsatrā* were plural forms, the final *a* would be short, or at least appear much more frequently short than long; while, on the contrary, these repeatedly recurring expressions, if I mistake not, have everywhere a long *a*, and only in the vocative a short *a* (Vend S p 67 Cf § 209). That the epithet *hudāonhō* is in the plural cannot incur doubt, from the dual nature of the *Amshasp* (cf §. 208.) this resembles, to a certain degree, the use of adjective genitives referring to a substantive in the ablative, which was mentioned in § 180. We find, also, the forms *amēshā spēntā* (Vend S p 313), which indeed might also be feminine plural forms, but shew themselves only as masculine duals, in the same meaning as the so frequent *amēshā spēntā*. We find also, frequently, *amēshā spēntā manyū,* "the two most holy spirits" (p 80), through which the dual form in *ā* of bases in *a* is likewise confirmed in the most unequivocal manner. The answer to the query, Whether generally only two *Amshaspants* are to be assumed? whether the genitive plural (*amēshanam spēntanam*), and sometimes also the accusative plural, is only the representative of the dual, which is very uncertain and shaken in its use? whether under the name *Amshaspants*, perhaps, we should always understand the Genu *Haerwat* (*Khorad*) and

*Ameštāt*





	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	HEBREW
	<i>vāch-ā,*</i>	<i>vāch-a,</i>	<i>ὄψις,</i>	.
[G Ed p 248.] m.	<i>bharant-āu,</i>	<i>barant-āo,</i>	.	.
	<i>bharant-ā,</i>	<i>barant-a,</i>	<i>φίροιτ-ς.</i>	..
m.	<i>ātman-āu,  </i>	<i>ašman-āo,</i>	...	.
	<i>ātman-ā,</i>	<i>ašman-a,</i>	<i>δαίμων-ς,</i>	N. V. <i>álmén-u</i>
n.	<i>nāmn-ī,</i>	. . .	<i>τάλαν-ς,</i>	.
m	<i>bhrātar-āu,</i>	<i>brātar-āo,</i>	.	.
	<i>bhrātar-ā</i>	<i>brātar-a,</i>	<i>πατίρ-ς,</i>	.
f	<i>duhitar-āu,</i>	<i>dughdhar-āo,</i>	.	.
	<i>duhitar-ā,</i>	<i>dughdhar-a,</i>	<i>θυγατίρ-ς,</i>	.
m.	<i>dātār-āu,†</i>	<i>dātār-ao,</i>	..	..
	<i>dātār-ā,</i>	<i>dātār-a,</i>	<i>δοτήρ-ς,</i>	...
n	<i>vachas-ī,</i>	.	<i>ἱπς(σ)-ς,</i>	.

## INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE, ABLATIVE.

215. These three cases have in the Sanskrit and Zend dual a common termination; while in Greek the genitive has joined itself to the dative, and borrowed its termination from it. It is in Sanskrit भ्याम् *bhyām*, which in Zend has been abbreviated to *bya*. Connected with the same is, first, the termination भ्यम् *bhyam*, which, in the pronoun of the two first persons, denotes the dative singular and plural, but in the singular of the first person has become abbreviated to ह्यम् *hyam* (§ 23). This abbreviation appears, however, [G Ed p 249] to be very ancient, as the Latin agrees

\* The Vêda duals in *ā* are as yet only cited in bases in *a*, *n*, and *av* (ऋ, § 1), however, the Zend leads us to expect their extension to the other consonantal declensions, as also the circumstance that, in other parts of grammar, in the Vêdas *ā* is occasionally found for *āu*, and other diphthongs, e g नाभा *nābhā*, as locative for नाभौ *nābhāu*, from नाभि *nābhi*. "navel"

† See the marginal note marked ( ), p 229.

remarkably with it, and *mi hi* corresponds to मयम् *mu hyam* as *ti bi* does to तुभ्यम् *tu bhyam*. In the second place भ्यम् *bhyas* which expresses the dative and ablative plural is pronounced in Zend *byō* (§ 56<sup>b</sup>) in Latin *bus* suppressing the *y* and with the usual change of *as* into *us*. The Lithuanian has *mus* for *bus* in the dative plural (§ 63) this more complete form has however remained only in the pronoun of the two first persons where *mu mus nobis* \* *tu mus vobis* are used as well as *mu m s tu m s* while in all other words we find simply *ms* as the sign of the dative—*nilka ms* &c. In the dual dative the Lithuanian has only the *m* of the Sanskrit termination भ्याम् *bhyām* as *nilka m*. Thus *m* is however not the final letter of *bhyām* but the initial labial *b* in a nasal form (§ 63)\* to me at least it appears improper to regard this dual termination otherwise than that of the cognate plural case, and I have no doubt of the identity of the *m* of *nilka-m* λυκοιμ with that of *nilka ms* (for *nilka mus*) λυκοις. According to this explanation therefore the German plural dative corresponds to the Lithuanian dual dative *nilsa m gasti m sunu m* †

216 A third form related to the dual ter [G Ed p 250] termination भ्याम् *bhyām* is भिस् *bhis* as sign of the instrumental plural. This termination which is in Zend *biś bis*

\* On the facile transition of *i* into *m* (cf p 114) rests also, I doubt not the connexion of the termination दुयम् *duyam* 'ye two' द्यम् *dyam* 'we two' with the common termination *du* before vowels *du* which in the pronouns spoken of has stiffened into *um* and in this form has remained even before consonants. Whether the case is the same with the verbal third dual person ऋम् *ṛam* shall be discussed hereafter.

† Cf Grimm, I § 8 17 where the identity of the Lithuanian German inflection *m* with the *b* (*bh* of the older languages) was first shown. When however Grimm l c, says of the Lithuanian that only the pronouns and adjectives have *ms* in the dative plural the substantives simply *m* this is perhaps a mistake or the plural is named instead of the dual for Rukig gives *ponams* 'dominus, armis oculis' &c.

(also  $\text{भ्यः}$  *bis*), has in Latin fixed itself in the dative and ablative,\* which must together supply the place of the instrumental, while in Lithuanian, with the exchange of the labial medial for the nasal of this organ (§ 63.), *mis* is the property of the instrumental alone, so that *puli-mis* answers to  $\text{पतिभिस्}$  *pali-bhis*,  $\text{पुलिभ्यः}$  *puli-bis*

217 I have already elsewhere affirmed, that the Greek termination  $\phi\iota$ ,  $\phi\iota\nu$ , is to be referred to this place,† and what is there said may be introduced here also. If  $\phi\iota\nu$ , and not  $\phi\iota$ , be assumed to be the elder of the two forms, we may offer the conjecture that it has arisen from  $\phi\iota\varsigma$ , following the analogy of the change of  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  into  $\mu\epsilon\nu$  in the 1st person plural, which corresponds to the Sanskrit *mas* and Latin *mus*,  $\phi\iota\varsigma$  would correspond to the Sanskrit *bhis* and Latin *bis*, in *nobis*, *vobis*. Perhaps, also, there originally existed a difference between  $\phi\iota$  and  $\phi\iota\nu$  (which we find used indifferently for the singular and plural), in that the former may have belonged to the singular, the latter to the plural, and they may have had the same relation to one another that, in Latin, *bi* has to *bis* in *tibi* and *vobis*; and that, in Lithuanian, *mi* has to *mis* in *akimi*, “through the eye,” and *akimis*, “through the eyes” It has escaped notice that the terminations  $\phi\iota$  and

[G Ed p 251]  $\phi\iota\nu$  belong principally to the dative their locative and instrumental use  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\phi\iota$ ,  $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta\phi\iota$ ,  $\beta\acute{\iota}\eta\phi\iota\nu$  is explained by the fact, that the common dative also has assumed the sign of these relations. The strict genitive use of the termination  $\phi\iota$ ,  $\phi\iota\nu$ , may perhaps be altogether denied; for if prepositions, which are elsewhere used in construction with the

\* In the 1st and 2d pronoun (*no-bis*, *vo-bis*), where *bis* supplies the place of the *bis* which proceeds from  $\text{भ्यः}$  *bhyas*

† Trans Berlin Academy, 1826 Comparison of Sanskrit with its cognate languages, by Prof Bopp Essay III. p 81

‡ Observe, also, that the Sanskrit instrumental termination *bhis* has been, in Pîākūt, corrupted to  $\text{हिं}$  *hin*

genitive occur also with the case in  $\phi\iota$   $\phi\iota\nu$ , we are not compelled on this account to regard the latter as the genitive or representative of the genitive. In general all prepositions, which are used in construction with the genitive would according to the sense be better used with an ablative or a locative if these cases were particularly represented in Greek. The suffix  $\thetaεν$  also of genuine ablative signification expressing separation from a place is incorrectly considered to represent the genitive termination where the latter in the common dialect, has received the sign of the lost ablative. In ὅσσε δακρυοφιν πιμπλαντο δακρυοφιν would in Sanskrit be rendered by अश्रुभिः *asrubhis* the relation is entirely instrumental and is not changed because the verb mentioned is more usually though less suitably used with the genitive. The same is the case with ὅσσε δα κρυοφιν τερσαιτο. In Ἰλίοφι κλυτα τείχεα it is not requisite to make Ἰλίοφι governed by τείχεα but it may be regarded as locative *to Ilium*. And in Od XII 45 (πολὺς δ' ἀμφοστοφιν θίς ἀνδρῶν πυθομένων) there is no necessity to look upon οστοφιν as the genitive for it can be aptly rendered by *ossibus*. I know no passages besides where a genitive meaning could be given to forms in  $\phi\iota$  and  $\phi\iota\nu$ . To the accusative likewise the form  $\phi\iota$   $\phi\iota\nu$  is foreign and according to its origin does not suit it nor does it appear in the train of prepositions which elsewhere occur with the accusative with the single exception of ἐς ἔννηφιν in Hesiod (cf. Buttmann p. 205). As to the opinion [G. Fd p. 25<sup>n</sup>] of the old Grammarians that  $\phi\iota$   $\phi\iota\nu$  may stand also in the nominative and vocative and as to the Impropriety of the  $\iota$  subscribed before this termination in the dative singular of the first declension we refer the reader to what Buttmann (p. 205) has rightly objected on this head.

218 The neuters in  $\Sigma$  mentioned in § 128 are nearly the only ones from bases ending with a consonant which occur in combination with  $\phi\iota$   $\phi\iota\nu$  in forms like ὄχεσφι

ὄρσσι-φι, στήθεσσι-φιν, which have been misunderstood, because the Σ dropped before vowel terminations was not recognised as the property of the base. Of the other consonants, ν is the only one, and ΚΟΤΥΛΗΔΟΝ the only ν base, which occurs in combination with φιν, and since Ν does not combine with Φ so readily as Σ, it assumes an auxiliary vowel ο—κοτυληδόν-ο-φιν after the analogy of compound words like κυν-ο-θαρσής. This example is followed, without the necessity for it however, by δάκρυ δακρυόφιν, while ναύ-φιν, in an older point of view, resembles exactly the Sanskrit नौभिस् *nāubhis*; for in compounds, also, the base ΝΑΥ keeps free from the conjunctive vowel ο, on which account ναύσταθμον may be compared with Sanskrit compounds like नौस्थ *nāu-stha*, “standing (being) in the ship”

219. But to return to the Sanskrit dual termination भ्याम् *bhyām*, it is further to be remarked, that before it a final स *a* is lengthened, hence, वृकाभ्याम् *vṛkābhyām* for वृकभ्याम् *vṛkabhyām*. It hardly admits of any doubt, that this lengthening extended to the cognate plural termination भिस् *bhis*; and that hence, from वृक *vṛka* also *vṛkā-bhis* would be found. The common dialect has, however, abbreviated this form to वृकैस् *vṛkâis*, which is easily derived from *vṛkābhis* by rejecting the *bh*, for ऐ *âi* is, according

[G. Ed p 253] to §. 2, = *â + i*. This opinion, which I have before expressed,\* I can now support by new arguments. In the first place, which did not then occur to me in discussing this question, the pronouns of the two first persons really form from their appended pronoun स्मा *sma*, *smâ-bhis*, hence अस्माभिस् *asmâbhis*, युष्माभिस् *yushmâbhis*, which forms stand in the same relation to the वृकाभिस् *vṛkā-bhis*, assumed by me, that the accusatives अस्मान् *asmân*, युष्मान् *yushmân*, do to वृकान् *vṛkân*, “*lupos*.” Secondly, the opinion

\* Trans. Berlin Academy, 1826. Comparison of Sanskrit with its cognate languages, by Prof Bopp. Essay III p. 79

which I arrived at theoretically has since then been so far practically established by the Veda dialect that in it from a final *ṣa* not *ābhis* but *ēbhis* has been formed according to the analogy of the dative and ablative as *वृकैभ्यस् vrikēbhyaś* hence *अश्वेभिसः aśvēbhīś* *per equos* from *अश्वाś* *asva*. In the common dialect the pronominal form *एभिस् ēbhis* *per hos* answers to this Veda form, which must properly be derived from the pronominal base *ṣa* which generally plays the chief part in the declension of *इदम् idam*. Though then on one side from the pronoun *ṣa* springs the form *एभिस् e bhis* on the other side from *अस्मः asma* and *युष्मः yushma* proceed the forms *अस्माभिसः asmābhīś* *युष्माभिसः yushmābhīś*, and though the Veda dialect in its substantive and adjective bases in *a* attaches itself to the former form still no necessity hence arises for supposing the abbreviated *āis* to be based on an *e bhis*\* as that could never lead to *āis*. Perhaps however *ābhis* might become *ēbhis* either through the assimilative force of the *i* of *bhis* or through analogy to [G Ed p 204] the dative *e-bhyaś* the *ē* of which may in like manner owe its origin to the re-activo influence of the *य y* †

220 The Prakrit has fully followed out the path commenced by the Veda dialect, and changed into *ए ē* the *ā* of

\* From *ēbhis* would come after rejecting the *ā* not *ais* but *ayis* for *ē = a + i* cannot be combined with a following *i* into a diphthong or as it is itself already a diphthong into a triphthong

† I do not regard the Veda *नद्येऽसः nadyeś* as, for *नदीभिसः nādībhīś* as an abbreviation of *nādībhīś* (for after rejecting the *bh*, from *nādī + is* would be formed *nādīs*) but as a very common instrumental, for which an extension of the base *nād* to *nadya* is to be assumed. On the other hand the Zend pronominal instrumental *dīs* mentioned by Burnouf (Nouv Journ Asiat III 310) may here be considered which occurs frequently in the *Jezline* and is probably an abbreviation of *द्विभिसः dvībhīś* or *द्विभ्यः dvībhyaś* from a base *dī* the accusative of which *द्विम् dīm* *hum* is often found with *i* unlengthened contrary to § 64. The connection of the base *द्वि dī* with *द्वे dvē* *ta* cannot on this account be disputed

[illegible]

By rejecting the labial, as in वृक्षैस् *vrkhâis* from वृक्षाभिस *vrkhâbhis*, and by contracting the याम् *yām* to *v*, as when, in Sanskrit, for *yashta*, *ishta* is said, from *yaj*, “to sacrifice,” and in Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 *im*, “hæc,” for 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *vyam* (see, also, § 42)

above mentioned where therefore the first *i* would fall to the base which it lengthens the other to the termination. The third declension by its forms like *δαίμοι ον*, might give rise to the conjecture that *ον* and not *ιν* is the true termination the latter however is shewn to be so from the two first declensions, where *η* and not *ον* is attached to the final vowel of the base (*Μουσα η*, *λογο-η*). In the third therefore we explain the *ο* before *ιν* in the same manner as § 218 before *φιν* (*κοτυληδον-ο φιν*) viz as a conjunctive vowel which has made its way from the bases which necessarily have it *i* *e* from those terminating in a consonant into those which might dispense with it (into the bases in *i* and *υ*) as in general in the third declension the consonantal bases have given the tone and have shewn the way to the vowels *i* and *υ*. It might however not [G Ed p 238] have been necessary for the conjunctive vowel *ο* to make its appearance between consonants and the termination as *δαίμοι ιν* could very easily be uttered but the *ο* of *δαίμοι οιν* comes evidently from a time when the *ιν* was still preceded by the consonant which the corresponding Sanskrit termination *bhyām* leads us to expect, in all probability a *φ* thus *δαίμοι ο ιν* from *οαίμοι ο φιν*\* We should have therefore here a different *φιν* from that which in § 217 we endeavoured to explain from *φης* *φιν* *bhis* the nasal in the dual (*φ*)*η* stands quite regularly for its predecessor *m* as in general at the end of words. In order to present to our

---

\* The conjunctive vowel *ο* therefore before the dual termination *η* has an origin exactly similar to that of the possessive suffix *εστ* which has been already elsewhere compared with the Sanskrit *यत्* *tant*. *Est* must therefore have been originally pronounced *Fest*, and the conjunctive vowel which the digamma made requisite or desirable before consonantal bases and which from thence has extended itself to the whole third declension has remained also after the digamma has been dropped, and thus *πυρ-ο-εστ* answers to *πυρ ι* from *τρυρ* on the other hand, *τρυρ εστ* to *τρυρ* (*τρυρ* )



view still more clearly how forms quite similar take root in the language as corruptions of preceding dissimilar forms, let the form *ἐτυπτον* be considered as the first person singular and third person plural, in one case from *ἐτυπτομ*, in the other from *ἐτυπτοντ*

222. If the dual termination *iv* be explained as a contraction of *bhyām*, we shall have found, also, the origin of the dative plural termination *iv*, which appears to have been changed in this number in the pronouns of one gender as it were by accident (*ἡμ' - iv*, *ὕμ' - iv*, *σφ' - iv*, together with *σφί - σι*). The Greek, however, in this respect, is guided or misled by the Sanskrit, or, more correctly, the distinction of the plural dative of the pronouns of one gender is very ancient, and the Sanskrit has in them *भ्यम् bhyām* as termination (*अस्मभ्यम् asma-bhyām*, "nobis," *युष्मभ्यम् yushma-bhyām*,

(G Ed p 257) "*vobis*"), opposed to the *भ्यस् bhyas* of all other words. From this *bhyām*, then, we arrive at *iv* quite as easily, or more so, than from the dual termination *bhyām* (cf § 42) As, however, *भ्यम् bhyām*, and its abbreviated form *भ्यम् hyām*, according to § 215, has also its place in the singular dative of the pronouns of one gender, but occurs nowhere else, as, moreover, the Latin also, in the pronouns referred to, has maintained a genuine dative termination, and to the common *i*, which is borrowed from the locative, presents in contrast the termination *bi* or *hi* (for *bhi*) (§ 200), we can, therefore, in the singular *iv* also of *ἐμ' - iv*, *τε - iv*, *τ' - iv*, *ἱν*, *σφ' - iv*, see nothing else than an abbreviation of *भ्यम् bhyām*, a form which the Latin and Greek have shared in such a manner, that the former has retained the beginning and the latter the end In the *i* both coincide\* The occasional accu-

\* A short time since, Max Schmidt, in his excellent treatise "*Commentatio de Pronomine Græco et Latino*" (p 77), endeavoured to connect the termination *iv* here treated of with the Sanskrit in a different way, by designating it as the sister form of the pronominal locative termination

sative use of this termination in Theocritus is to be explained from its original signification being no longer felt and the exchange of its  $\iota$  with that of the accusative thereby caused. On the other hand we have in  $\mu\iota$  and  $\nu\iota$  real accusatives and should therefore divide them  $\mu\iota\iota$ ,  $\nu\iota\iota$  and not assume with Buttmann (p. 296) a connection between this form and the dative  $\tau\iota$ .

223 As to the origin of the  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$  suffixes [C. El. p. 2. 8.]  $\text{भियं } bhi\epsilon$   $\text{भ्यम् } bhy\text{-am}$   $\text{भ्याम् } bhy\ \dot{a}m$  and  $\text{भ्यः } bhy\ as$  which begin with  $\text{भ्य } bhy$  (from  $\text{भि } bhi$ ) we must notice first their connection with the preposition  $\text{अभि } abhi$  to to wards against (whence  $\text{अभिप्राय } abhi\ prāy$  at of apud.) However in  $abhi$  itself  $bhi$  is clearly in like manner the termination and the demonstrative  $\text{अ} a$  the theme so that this preposition in respect to its termination is to be regarded as a sister form to the Latin  $ti\ bi\ si\ bi\ i\ bi\ u\ bi$ ,\* just as another preposition which springs from the pronominal base  $a\ \nu\iota\tau$   $\text{अधु } adhu$  over finds analogous forms in the Greek locatives like  $\delta\text{-}\theta\iota$ ,  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\text{-}\theta\iota$   $\omicron\upsilon\pi\alpha\iota\omicron\ \theta\iota$  (§ 16.) I related to the suffix  $\text{स्य } dhi\ \epsilon$   $\text{स्य } dhi\ a$  which has been retained in the common dialect only in the abbreviation  $ha$  in  $i\ ha\ i$  here and in the preposition  $sa\ ha$  "with" but in the Vedic dialect exhibits the original form and more extended diffusion and in the Zend also is found in several pro-

termination  $\text{इति } ita$  (§ 201.) In this view similar forms would be contracted exclusive of the length of the Greek  $\epsilon$ , which according to my explanation may pass as compensation for the  $a$  which has been dropped. Still I lay less stress on the difference of quantity than on this, that it is precisely the pronouns of one gender in the Sanskrit which exhibit in the locative not  $in$  but the common  $\epsilon$  (§ 201.) But I attach still more weight to what has been said above in support of my opinion.

\* In Prakrit the termination  $\text{सि } i\ u$  which is connected with  $\text{सि } i\ i$  (cf. § 21.) unites  $al\ o$  with other pronominal bases for the formation of locative adverbs as  $\text{पटि } ta\ hu$  there  $\text{अटि } ka\ hu$  "where."

nominal bases with a locative signification, e g *ava-dha*, "here." In the Greek, compare *θα* of *ἐνθα*, opposed to *θεν*, from *ἐνθεν*, *ἐμθεν*, &c, from *धस् dhas*, for *तस् tas*, in *अधस् a-dhas*, "beneath" in which formations ध् *dh* stands as a permutation of *t*, and occurs in this way, also, in some other formations\* Therefore *dha*, *dhu*, are to be derived from the demonstrative base *त ta*, but it is more difficult to trace the origin of the भि *bhi* of अभि *abhi* (Greek *ἀμφί*) I suspect that an initial consonant has been

[G Ed p 259] dropped. As in Greek, also, *φίν* is used for *σφίν*, and as in Sanskrit *विंशति vīśati* "twenty," is clearly an abbreviation of *द्विंशति dvīśati*, and in Zend *𐬨𐬀 biš*, "twice," *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 bitya*, "the second," is used for *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 dvīš*, (Sanskrit *द्विस् dvis*), *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 dvitya* (Sanskrit *द्वितीय dvitīya*), so भि *bhi* may be identical with the pronominal base *स sua* or *सि sui* whence the Greek *σφίς*, *σφίν*, *φίν*, &c, and so indeed, that after the *s* has been dropped, the following semi-vowel has been strengthened or hardened, just as in the Zend *𐬨𐬀 biš*, *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 bitya*, and the Latin *bis*, *bi* The changed sibilant might also be recognised in the aspiration of the भ् *bh*, as, in Prākṛit (§. 166), *समा sma* has become *स्महा*, and, (which comes still closer to the case before us), in Greek for *σφίν* is found also *ψίν* And, in Sanskrit, that भ् *bh* should spring from *b + h* is not entirely unknown, and in this way is to be explained the relation of *भूयस् bhūyas*, "more," to *बहु bahu*, "much," the *a* being rejected (Gramm. Crit r 251 Rem)

224 The following will serve as a general view of the dual termination under discussion, in Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Lithuanian —

\* Among others, in the 2d person plural of the middle *धे dhu* and *धाम dhuam* for *ते tué*, *तम् tuam*





become *o* or *au* as before the appended particles *cha* and *chit*, the Greek exhibits *es* under the restriction of § 228 the Latin *es*\* with unorganic length of quantity through the influence of the *s*, the Lithuanian has *es* in bases in *r* but elsewhere simple *s*. Thus the words दुहृतरम् *duhutar as* मृगधरम् *dughdhar as cha* धृतरम् *es dukter es matr es* correspond with one another

227 The *a* of the termination is melted [G I d p २०२] down with a preceding *a* of the base to *ā* thus वक्रिष् *vrikas* from *vrika + as* corresponds to the Gothic *vulfōs* from *IULIAus* (§ 69). In this concretion only however with the vowel of the base the Gothic has preserved the full termination but elsewhere both with vowel and consonantal bases the *s* alone of the old *as* is left as in general the termination *as* in Gothic polysyllabic forms has everywhere been weakened to *is* or *s* (cf §§ 13, 191) hence *sunys alman s* for *sunv as alman as*. And *ā* too is contracted with the termination *as* to *ds* hence *jiuās* for *jiuā as*. It cannot however be shewn with certainty from what has been just said that the Gothic *gibōs*, from *GIBŌ* has simple *s* or *as* (contracted with the base vowel to *ō=ā*) for its case designation

228 The masculine pronominal bases in a refuse in Sanskrit Zend and Gothic the full nominative designation and in place of it extend the base by the addition of *in* † which according to § 2 with the *a* of the base forms *ā ē* ‡ for which in Zend is used *re ē* or *ā ē*

\* Vide § 707 p 1048

† As *a* is lengthened in many other cases to *ā ē* and with this the case terminations are then first conjoined there is good ground to assume that in *ā ē* and similar forms no case designation at all is contained and that the pronouns as purely words of personality find themselves sufficiently personified in this case through themselves alone as in the singular *sa* is said for *sas* in Sanskrit as in Gothic and in Greek for *s* while in Latin with *is te* also *ipse* and *ill* are robbed of the nominative sign. This opinion is remarkably confirmed by the fact that अमी *ami* (Grimm

hence, Sanskrit ते *tē*, Zend 𐬔𐬀 *tē*, Gothic *thai*, "this,"

[G Ed p 263] answering to the feminine form 𐬀𐬔𐬀 *tās*, 𐬀𐬔𐬀 *tāo* (§ 56<sup>b</sup>), *thās*. To this corresponds, in Greek, *τοί* (Doric for *οί*). In Greek and Latin, however, this *i*, which practically replaces the termination *as* (*cs*, *ēs*), has not remained in the masculine pronominal bases in *o* (= *अ* *a*, § 116), but all other bases of the second, as of the first declension, have, in Greek and Latin, taken example from it, hence, *λύκοι*, *χωραι*, for *λυκο-ες*, *χωρα-ες*, *λυρι* (from *λυροι*), *terræ* (from *τεριαι*), for *λυρο-ες*, *terra-ες*. The Latin fifth declension, although in its origin identical with the first (§ 121), has preserved the old termination, hence, *rēs* from *rē-ēs*, as, in Sanskrit *गृह्वीस* from *गृह्वी-अस*. The Lithuanian has fixed narrower restrictions than the Greek and Latin on the misuse of the pronominal inflexion under discussion, *oi*, to speak more correctly, want of inflexion: it gives, indeed, *wilkai*=*λύκοι*, *lyri*, but not *rankai*, but *rankos*. Honour, therefore, to the Gothic! that in this respect it has not overstepped by one hair the old Sanskrit-Zend limits, for that the adjective *a* bases, as they in general follow the pronominal declension, give also *ai* for *ās* (*blindai* "cæci") is, therefore, no violation of the old law.

229 In Zend, in consonantal bases the dual termination 𐬀𐬀 *āo* also (from 𐬀𐬀 *ās*, § 207) occurs with a plural signification, thus, frequently, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vāh-āo*, "voes," 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀

Crit § 271) shews itself clearly through most of the oblique cases, as *amī-byas*, "illis," *amī-hām*, "illorum," to be the naked theme. The form which occurs in the Zend-Avesta 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *višpeš-cha*, "omnesque" (V S p 49), considered as a contraction of *višpay-as-cha* (cf § 244), leads to the conjecture, that to ते *tē*, and similar uninflected forms, the termination *as* also might attach itself, thus, तयस् *tay-as*. In Zend, the pronominal form in *ē* occurs, for the most part, in the accusative plural, and thus the abovementioned *višpeš-cha* I c stands probably as accusative, although, according to Anquetil's inaccurate translation, it might be regarded as the nominative.

*raoch-do* "lucet" which forms cannot be regarded perhaps, as regular plurals of bases in *d* for I believe [C Ed p 764] I can guarantee that there exists no such base as *արաժ* *aradž* and *արժա՞ր* *aradž*. The form *Վարջա՞ր* *varjdhar* in a bases as *Վարջա՞ր/արժ* *varjdhar/ard* *luf* and *lupos* rests on that in the Vedas but which only occurs in the nominative *असः* *asas* (§ 36) e.g. *सिन्धुसः* *stomdsas* "sons of praise" for *सिन्धुस* *stomds* from *सिन्धु* *stoma*.\*

230 Bases in *i* and *u* have in Sanskrit Guna hence *սահ* *patay-as* *սահ* *sunar-as* for *paly as sunu-as*. The Gothic also has preserved this Guna but in its weakened form *i* (§ 27) which before *u* becomes *y* hence, *sunyu s* sons (for *sunnu s* from *sunau s*) a form which would be unintelligible without the Guna theory which has been shewn to belong to the German. In *i* bases the Guna *i* is melted down with that of the base to long *i* (written *ei* § 70) hence *gaslei s* *anslei s* from *GASII ANSII* (cf p 100) The Zend employs Guna or not at pleasure hence *պարթաւ* *party-o* or *patay d*† *պարթաւ* *party d* or *pasar d*.

231 Neuters have in Zend as in the cognate European languages a short *a* for their termi. [C Ed p 765] nation† perhaps the remains of the full *as* which belongs to the natural genders after the *s* which is too per

\* This form is, in my opinion to be so regarded as that for greater emphasis, the termination *as* has been a second time appended to the termination which had become concrete with the base.

† The *i* which according to § 41 is blended with the base remains in spite of the *a* preceding the *j*.

‡ Simple as this point is I have nevertheless found it very difficult to come to a firm conclusion regarding it although from the first I have directed my attention towards it. Burnouf has already (Nouv. Journ. Asiat. III 309 310) given the plural neuter form, and instituted comparisons with the Gothic and Greek. &c. But from forms like *tu mata bene cogitata*, "*tueta beie d eta*" it cannot be perceived what the neuter plural termination properly is because setting out with the Sanskrit we are tempted to assume that the true termination in these forms has



sonal for the dead speechless gender, has been dropped.

[G Ed p 266] This *a* remains, then, in the accusative. The masculine and feminine have, in the same case, generally likewise *a*s (Zend 𐬀𐬭𐬀, 𐬀𐬭𐬀 *aścha*) The following are examples. 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *ashavan-a*, "prince," 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *bēřzant-a*, "splendens," 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *vāch-a*, "verba," 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *nar-a*, "homines," 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *ast-a*, "ossa" In nominal bases in *a* the termination is melted down with the vowel of the base the *ā* so produced has, however, in the received condition of the language, according to a

has been dropped, and its loss either compensated by lengthening the final vowel, or not We must therefore direct our attention to bases with a different termination than *a*, especially to such as terminate with a consonant The examination of this subject is, however, much embarrassed, in that the Zend, without regard to the gender of the singular, is prone, contrary to natural expectation, to make every noun neuter in the plural, an inclination which goes so far, that the numerous class of *a* bases have hereby entirely lost the masculine nominative, and but sparingly exhibit the masculine accusative When, e g *mashya*, "human being," is, in the plural nominative, likewise, *mashya* (with *cha*, *mashyā-cha*), here I am nevertheless convinced that this plural *mashya*, or *mashyā*, is not an abbreviation of *mashyān* from *mashyās* (§ 56<sup>b</sup>), as in no other part of Zend Grammar *a* or *ā* stands for 𐬀𐬭𐬀 *ās* I am persuaded that this form belongs to the neuter The replacing, however, of the plural masculine by neuters rests upon a deep internal feeling of the language, for in the plural number it is clear that gender and personality are far in the back ground. The personality of the individual is lost in the abstract infinite and inanimate plurality, and so far we can but praise the Zend for its evitiation of gender in the plural We must blame it, however, in this point, that it does not, in all places, bring the adjectives or pronouns into concord with the substantives to which they refer, and that in this respect it exhibits a downright confusion of gender, and a disorder which has very much impeded the inquiry into this subject Thus, e g *vīšpa anaghra-a oochāo* (not *raoch-ā*), "all lights which have had no beginning," *tisarō* (fem) *śata* or *thrayō* (masc) *śata*, "three hundred," *chathwārō* (masc) *śata* "four hundred" In general the numbers "three" and "four" appear to have lost the neuter, hence, also, *thrayō csafr-a*, "three nights," *chathwārō csafr-a*, "four nights" in Vend S p 237, on the other hand, stands *tā nar a yā*, "those persons who . . ." I divide thus *nar-a* although

principle often quoted been again shortened and remains only in monosyllabic bases and before annexed particles. The Gothic and Zend in this respect stand [G Ed p 267] very remarkably upon one and the same footing for *thō hac* is used (for *thū* § 69) from *THAa* *hrō quæ* for *HVAa*, but *daura* from *DAURA* as in Zend *awr tō hac* *awr yd quæ* opposed to *awr agha peccata* from *agha*. It cannot therefore be said of the Gothic that the *a* of the base has been dropped before that of the termi-

although the form might also belong to a theme *nara* which also occurs but much less frequently than *nar* whence also elsewhere the masculine *nar u tai cha*, and those persons. From the theme *i ch* 'word speech' we find frequently *i ch a* (also erroneously as it appears, *iach a*), e.g. Vend S p 34 *awr awr xwaxw awr xwaxw awr xwaxw awr xwaxw* *i ch a humata hucta hwarista*, 'verba bene cogitata bene dicta bene peracta'. From *awr awr xwaxw* *ashatan* 'pure' occurs very often the neuter plural *ashana a* although the theme *ashatan* sometimes too although very rarely extends itself unorganically to *ashatana* this form proves less (though it be incorrect) that the neuter *ashatan a* should be derived from the unorganic extremely rare *ashatana*, than from the genuine and most common *ash tan* in the weak cases *ashaun* or *ashaon*. Participial forms too in *nt* are very common in the neuter plural and I have never found any ground for assuming that the Zend like the Pāli and Old High German has extended the old participial theme *ly a* by a vowel addition. In the Vend S p 110 we find an accusative *agha awr xwaxw tār a* 'peccata corruptentia (?)'. Anquetil renders both expressions together by 'la corruption du cœur' (II 22) but probably *awr xwaxw tār a* stands for *awr xwaxw tār a* and means literally 'the destroying' (cf *fx ksh* intrins 'to be ruined'). So much is certain that *awr* is a preposition (p 49) and *tār* is the suffix used in the formation of the word (§ 144) which is in the strong cases *tār* and from this example it follows as also from *ashatan a* that where there are more forms of the theme than one the Zend like the Sanskrit (see Gramm Crit. I 185 c) forms the nominative accusative and vocative plural from the stronger theme. I refrain from adducing other examples for the remarkable and not to have been expected proposition that the Zend in variance from the Sanskrit forms its plural neuters according to the principle of the Latin *nomin a* Greek *τ λαν* Gothic *namon a* or *namn a*.

nation, for it could not be dropped, because the base-vowel and termination have been, from the first, con- crete. The old length of quantity might, however, be weakened this is the fate of long vowels especially at the end of words. It cannot, therefore, be said of the Greek τὰ δῶρα and the Latin *dona*, that the *a* entirely belongs to the termination, This *a* is an old inheritance of the oldest date, from the time when the second declension, to use the expression, terminated its bases with *ǎ*. Thus *ǎ* has since then become, in Greek, *o* or *c* (§ 204.), in Latin, *u*, *o*, or *e*, and has maintained its ancient quality only in the plural neuter, and the *ā*, which has grown out of *ā* + *ǎ*, has become shortened. This *ǎ*, however, in contrast with its offspring *ö*, *ë*, *ů*, may even pass for a more weighty ending, which unites base and termination, then if δῶρο or δῶρc, *donů*, *doně*, stood as the plural neuter.

232 Bases in *i* and *u* may, in Zend, suppress their final vowel before the termination, and *u* may be suppressed and replaced by lengthening the base-vowel thus we read in the Vend S pp 46 and 48, *garā*, "hills," from *gauri* (see p 196, Note †) on the other hand, p 313, *garīs* (fem). That which Anquetil (II 268) renders by "*une action qui empêche de passer le pont, le péché contre-nature,*" *i* uns in the original (p 119), *agha anāpērētha skyaothna yū narō-varipaya*, [G Ed p 268] *i e* "the sins which stop the bridge, the actions which . . .", and here it is evident that *anāpērētha* stands for *anāpērēthw-a*, for *pērētū* means actually "bridge"<sup>a</sup>

\* Burnouf's MS divides thus, *anā pērētha*, which is following Olshausen (p 6), but with the various reading *anāpērētha* I have no ground for assuming that in Zend there exists a preposition *anā*, "without," so that *anā pērētha* might mean "without a bridge", and that *pērētu* would, in the singular instrumental, form *pērētha* or *pērētava* I suppose, therefore, that *pērētu* may be conjoined with the preposition *ā*, and then the negative *an* have been prefixed

But a final u may also be retained, in the form of a semi-vowel either pure or with Gunn the latter form I recognise in ᳵ᳗᳚᳐᳚ ydāia (Vend S p 120 in Olshausen p. 7) which can only be the plural accusative of ᳶ᳗᳚ yātu for it stands with ᳶ᳗᳚ agha peccata and in the same page in Olshausen occurs a derivative of yātu in the accusative singular ᳶ᳚ ᳶ᳗᳚᳐᳚ᳶ᳚ yātumentum the magician gifted with magic (according to Anquetil magicien) I render therefore agha ydāia literally by the sins of sorcery (Anquetil la magie très mauvaise) and in Anquetil's Vocabulaire is (p 16<sup>n</sup>) ᳶ᳗᳚᳐᳚ yāthnam the regular plural genitive of our base yātu, which means therefore "of the sorceries", while Anquetil fruitfully gives it the meaning of the derivative (magiciens) and according to his custom takes this oblique case for a nominative. An example of a neuter plural form without Gunn is at V S p 122 ᳶ᳗᳚᳐᳚ᳶ᳚ hendia the Indies with hapti hendu the seven Indus (Ang II p 270). It has the epithet as tar-a ("up-starred") in opposition to ᳶ᳗᳚᳐᳚ᳶ᳚ ᳶ᳗᳚᳐᳚ᳶ᳚ᳶ᳚ dās astarem hendum to the ill starred (?) [G Ed p 960] the Indies. An example in which the suppressed termination in n u base is replaced by lengthening the final vowel is the very frequently occurring, ᳶ᳗᳚᳐᳚ vohu goods from ᳶ᳗᳚᳐᳚ vohu.

233 The interrogative base /i (cf *quis quid*) which in Sanskrit forms only the singular nominative accusative (neuter) कस् /i-m but is elsewhere replaced by /a whence in Zend کاس ka / what this base the use of which is very limited forms in Zend the plural neuter کاس kya and

\* V S p 341 աստ ասեալք արդեւս յիշ արանի իւրեանս անց  
արդեւս ասեալք *lyā aēl rael a yō hēntē gilhā lē a thris ā n r tē* (erro-  
neously *thris āmrutē*) What are the words which are thrice said in the  
prayers (songs)? The masculine forms *aēl* and *lyō* can here according  
to Note at § 231, occasion no difficulty So also V S p 80 անց *lyā*  
before

this form is the more important, since we still require examples which can be relied upon, in which the *i* of the base is not suppressed before the termination *a* (above, *gara* for *gany-a*), although it may with reason be conjectured, that, in accordance with the abovementioned *hēndi-a* and *yātav-a*, forms also like *vairy-a* or *vanay-a*, from *vairi*, were in use. As in Gothic, neuter substantive and adjective bases in *i* are wanting, the numeral base *THRI*, "three," and the pronominal base *I*, "he," are very important for the neuter cases under discussion, in which they form *thriy-a* (*thriya hunda*, "three hundred") and *iy-a*, according to the principle of the Sanskrit monosyllabic forms, of which the *i* sound has not passed into its simple semi-vowel, but into *iy*, thus, in Sanskrit, भिय *bhiy-ā*, from भि *bhī*.

231. The Sanskrit gives, in place of the Zend-European neuter *a*, an इ *i*, perhaps as the weakening of a former *a* [G Ed p 270] (§ 6), the final vowel of the base is lengthened, and between it and the case termination a euphonic *n* is placed (§ 133), hence दानानि *dānā-n-i*, वारीणि *vārī-n-i*, मधूनि *madhū-n-i* †. The bases which terminate with a single consonant—*n* and *r* being excepted prefix to it a nasal,

before the masculine *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *ratawō* (*𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *kya ratawō*, "which are the lords"?).

\* According to a euphonic law (Gram Cit 1 84<sup>a</sup>), an *n* following after *r*, and some other letters, is, under certain conditions, changed into *ṇ*.

† In the Vēdas, the *ni* in *a* bases is frequently found suppressed, e.g. विश्व *viśvā*, "omni," from *viśva*. In this way the Sanskrit is connected with the Zend *viśpa*, *viśpā-cha* but perhaps this coincidence is only external, for as the Sanskrit nowhere uses a neuter termination *a*, विश्व *viśvā* cannot well be deduced from *viśpa+a*, but can only be explained as an abbreviation of the *ā-ni*, which likewise occurs in the Vēdas, as also पुरु *puru*, "multa," "magna," is used for पुरुणि *puruṇi* (Rosen's Spec pp 9, 10).

and after *s* and *n* the preceding vowel is lengthened, hence वचसि *vachān si* नमसि *naman i*. Into relation with this *i* might be brought the neuter inflexion of *quæ* (*quai*) and *hæ-c* (*hauc*) which stand in Latin very isolated *quæ* is however, still tolerably distant from the Sanskrit कृत्वा *kr̥vā n i* while it is nearly identical with the neuter dual कृत्वे *kr̥tve* from *ka + i* (§ 212). Since however the antiquity of this dual termination is supported by the Zend the plural form *lanī* stands on the other side isolated and its age is thereby rendered doubtful as moreover the Latin in the verb also has introduced a termination originally dual into the plural\* [G Ed p 271] we cannot avoid recognising in the Latin plural *quæ* a remnant as true as possible of the Sanskrit dual कृत्वे *kr̥tve*.

23a We give here a general view of the formation of the plural nominative and of the vocative identical with it and the neuter accusative

SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUANIAN	GOthic
m <i>vikas</i>	<i>iehrhāonhō</i> †	λυκοι	<i>lup i</i>	<i>wilkai</i>	<i>vulfos</i>
m <i>tē</i>	<i>tē</i>	τοι	<i>is t i</i>	<i>tie †</i>	<i>thai</i>
n <i>dana n i</i>	<i>dana</i>	δῶρα	<i>dona</i>		<i>daura</i>
f <i>jihuaṣ</i>	<i>hi-lao</i>	χῶραι	<i>terrae</i>	<i>ran'os</i>	<i>gibos</i>

\* The termination *tis* answers to चसु *thas* Greek *ov* from *r s* not to च *tha* or त *ta* Greek *re*. With respect to the otherwise remarkable declension of *qui* and of *hic* which is akin to it I would refer preliminarily to my treatise On the Influence of Pronouns in the formation of Words (by F Dummmler), p 2

† See § 229

‡ This form belongs not to the base *TĀ* (= त *ta*) whence in the singular *ta s* and nearly all the other cases but to *TĪA* whence through the influence of the *s tie* has been developed (cf p 171 Note\* and § 193) and whence in the dative dual and plural *tie m ti ms*. The nominative plural *lanī* however without a case termination. The original form *TĪA* corresponds to the Veda त *tya* mentioned in § 194 while the base स्य *syā* (च *shya* see § 6.) is fully declined in Lithuanian in the form of *SZIE*, and in the plural nominative likewise without inflexion

	SANSKRIT	VEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOOTHIC
f	<i>tās,</i>	<i>tāo,</i>	<i>ταί,</i>	<i>is-tae,</i>	<i>tes,</i>	<i>thōs</i>
m	<i>patay-as,</i>	<i>party-ō,<sup>†</sup></i>	<i>πόσι-ες,</i>	<i>host'-ēs,†</i>	. . .	<i>gaster-s</i>
f	<i>prīlay-as,</i>	<i>āfi ity-ō,<sup>‡</sup></i>	<i>πόρτι-ες,</i>	<i>mess'-ēs,†</i>	<i>ūny-s,</i>	<i>anster-s</i>
n	<i>vāi'-n-i,</i>	<i>vai'-a,</i>	<i>ἰδρι-α,</i>	<i>marī-a,</i>	.	. . .
n.	. . .	<i>ky-a,†</i>	. . .	.	.	<i>vy-a</i>
[G f	<i>bhaviṣhyanty-as,</i>	<i>būṣhyanty-ō,<sup>‡</sup></i>	.	.	.	.
Ed. m	<i>sūnav-as,</i>	<i>paśv-ō,<sup>‡</sup></i>	<i>ἰχθύ-ες,</i>	<i>pecū-s,</i>	<i>sūnu-s,</i>	<i>sunyu-s</i>
p. f.	<i>tanav-as,</i>	<i>tanv-ō,</i>	<i>πίτυ-ες,</i>	<i>socrū-s,</i>	.	<i>handyu-s</i>
272. n	<i>madhū'-n-i,</i>	<i>madhv-a,</i>	<i>μέθυ-α,</i>	<i>pecu-a,</i>	. .	. . .
] f.	<i>vadhū-as,</i>	. .	. .	. .	.	. . .
m.f	<i>gāv-as,</i>	<i>geu-s,§</i>	<i>βό(F)-ες,</i>	<i>bov-ēs,†</i>		

is *szie* From the pronominal declension the form *ie* (from *ia*) has found its way into the declension of the adjective also so that the base *GERA*, "good," forms several cases from *GERIE*, viz dat du *gerie-m* for *gera-m*, dat pl *gerie-ms* for *gera-ms*, and nom pl *geri* for *gerai*. This *geri* appears to stand in most complete agreement with the Latin nominatives of the corresponding declension (*bonī, lupī*), but the difference between the two languages is this, that the *i* of *boni* (for *bono-i*) belongs to the termination, while *geri* is void of termination, and stands for *gerie* (analogous with *tie*), but this latter for *gerie-i* (cf *γαυνήκιε-ι*)

\* See p. 163, Note †

† See p. 1078

‡ To this *ky-a*, from *ki-a*, corresponds surprisingly the Latin *qui-a* (*quianam, quiane*), if, as I scarce doubt, it is a plural neuter, as *quod* is a singular neuter (cf Max Schmidt "De *gron Græco et Latino*," p. 34). In the meaning "that," *quā* is clearly shewn to be an accusative the meaning "because" is less apt for this case, and would be better expressed by an instrumental or an ablative, but in the singular *quod* we must be content to see the idea "because" expressed by an accusative. On the other hand, *quo*, among other meanings, signifies "whither," a genuine accusative signification in Sanskrit grammar. Without the support of *quod* we might conjecture that an instrumental singular had been preserved in *quia*, after the analogy of *παρty-a* *party-a*, for *parti*.

§ We might expect *gav-ō, gavaś-cha*, "bovesque;" but we read *γευ* *geus* in the Vend S p. 253, L. 9, in combination with the pronominal neuters *avō tā*, "illa," *avay yā*, "quæ," which, according to §. 231 Note, cannot surprise us.

SANSKRIT	Zend	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
f <i>nāi as</i>		ια(F) ες			
f <i>īāch as</i>	<i>vāch o *</i>	ὄπ ες	<i>loces †</i>		
m <i>bharant as</i>	<i>barēnt ō *</i>	φεροντ ες	<i>ferent es †</i>		<i>fiyand s</i>
m <i>almān-as</i>	<i>asman ō</i>	δαιμοι ες	<i>sermon es †</i>		<i>ahman s</i>
n <i>nāmān i</i>	<i>nāman a</i>	ταλαι α	<i>nomin a</i>		<i>namōn a</i>
m <i>bhratar as</i>	<i>br ītar ō *</i>	πατερ ες	<i>fratr-es †</i>		†
f <i>duhitar as</i>	<i>dughdhar ō *</i>	θυγατερ ες	<i>matr es †</i>	<i>dugter ēs</i>	
m <i>datur as</i>	<i>datār ō *</i>	δοτηρ ες	<i>dator es †</i>		
n <i>vachāns i</i>	<i>vachauh a §</i>	ἐπε(σ) α	<i>oper-a</i>		

## THE ACCUSATIVE

236 The bases which end with a short vowel annex *n* in Sanskrit and lengthen the final vowel of the base hence वृत्तिः *vṛttīn* पतिः *patīn* सनः *sunun* &c We might imagine this *n* to be related to the *m* of the singular accusative as in the verb the termination दन्ति *ḍnti* (1st pers sing imperative) has clearly proceeded from दन्मि *ḍmī* The cognate dialects speak however in favour of Grimm's acute conjecture that the Sanskrit *n* is in the accusative plural masculine, an abbreviation of *ns* || which has remained entire in the Gothic—*ulfa ns gast ns sunu ns*—but has been divided in the other sister languages since the Sanskrit according to § 91 has given up the latter of the two con-

\* See p 163 Note †

† See Note † in preceding page

‡ The Gothic *r* bases annex in the plural *a u* and can therefore be contrasted no further with the cognate languages *BRŪTHIR* becomes *BRŪTHRU* whence *brothryu s*, &c according to the analogy of *sunyu-s*

§ Or वाचनं *vachana* Thus we read Vend S p 127 *umenha* which I think must be regarded as accusative of *nīmō* (नमस *namas* adoration) and as governed by ब्रह्म *brahma*, 'from him who brings from him offering

|| The Old-Prussian too exhibits in the acc pl *ns* e.g. *tana ns par p s* Respecting the *īda* termination *nr*, from *ns* see § 517 Remark



sonants, and has lengthened, as it appears, in compensation for this, the final vowel of the base , while the Greek

[G Ed. p 274] *λύκους* has preserved the sibilant, but has permitted the *υ* to volatilize to *υ †* In fact, *λυκο-υς* has the same relation to *λυκους* that *τύπτουσι* has to *τύπτονσι*, from

[G Ed p 275] *τύπτοντι ‡* For *πόσι-ας*, *ιχθύ-ας*, we could not, however, expect a *πόσι-υς*, *ιχθύ-υς*, as the Greek makes the *ι* and *υ* bases in all parts similar to the bases which terminate with a consonant, which, in Sanskrit, have *as* for a termination, hence *पदस् padas* = *πόδας* and even in the most vigorous period of the language *ns* could not have attached itself to a consonant preceding. This *as* for *ns* may be compared with

~ Thus *vrīhān* for *vrīhans*, as, *विद्वांस् vidwāns*, whence the accusative *विद्वांसम् vidwāns-am*, in the uninflected nominative *विद्वान् vidwān*, (“*sapiens*”)

† As the *υ* also passes into *ι* (*τιθείς* for *τιθέυς*, Æolic *τύψαις*, *μέλαις* for *τυψαν(τ)ς*, *μελαινς*), Haitung (I c p 263) is correct in explaining in this sense the *ι* in Æolic accusative forms like *νόμοις*, *τοῖς στρατηγοῖς*, &c As regards, however, the feminine accusatives like *μεγάλαις*, *ποιμνίλαις*, *τείμαις*, quoted by him, I believe that they have followed the analogy of the masculines, from which they sufficiently distinguish their gender by the *α* preceding the *ι*, we cannot, however, thence infer, that also the first and specially feminine declension had originally accusatives in *υς*, as neither has the Gothic in the corresponding declension an *ns*, nor does the Sanskrit exhibit an *n* (see § 287, and cf Rask in Vater’s Tables of Comparison, p 62)

‡ It cannot be said that *τύπτουσι* proceeded from *τύπτονται*, a truly monstrous form, which never existed in Greek, while the *τύπτοντι* before us answers to all the requirements of Greek Grammar, as to that of the whole base, since *ο-ντι* corresponds to the Sansk *anti*, Zend *ēnti*, Goth *nt’*, and from the singular *τι* (Dor.), in the plural nothing else than *ντι* can be expected But to arrive at *ουσι* from *οντι* it is not requisite to invent first so strange a form as *ονται*, for that *οντι* can become *ουσι* is proved by the circumstance that the latter has actually arisen from it, by the very usual transition of T into Σ, and the not rare vocalization of the N to Y, as also in Sanskrit, in all probability, *उस् us* has arisen from *nt* (cf p 172, Note \*), of which more hereafter But if in the dative plural, indeed, *ου-σι* has arisen from *οντ-σι*, not from *ον-σι* (*λέουσι* not *δαίμουσι*), we

the Ionic *αται ατο* for *νται, ντο* a form which has extended from the places where the vocalization of the *ν* was necessary to those also where *ι* might be added (*πεπιθатаι τετραφαται* then, also *πεπανатаι, κεκλιатаι* &c for *πεπαννται κεκλινται*) This comparison with the 3d person plural appears to me the more in point as in my opinion the *η* in the presupposed forms like चक्र *crilans* पतिस् *patins* लुकोस् has the same object that it has in the 3d person plural viz. allusion to plurality by extending (nasalizing) the syllable preceding the sign of personality The introduction of a nasal is an admixture which is least of all foreign and comes nearest to the mere lengthening of an already existing vowel.

237 Feminine bases with a final vowel follow in Sanskrit the analogy of consonantal bases but with the suppression of the *α*\* thus *s* for *as* or *ns* they may perhaps too never have had *as* for else hence would have arisen *as* in the masculine a simple *n* to the [G Ed p 276]

we must remember that the abandonment of the *n* before case terminations beginning with a consonant is very old and therefore pre-Greek phenomenon which is not to be accounted for in the Greek and wherefore no compensation is to be required for the *ν* which has been dropped But even if it were so we must still be satisfied if the demand for compensation for a lost *ν* remains unfulfilled in several places of grammar for there are two kinds of euphonic alteration in all languages the one which has acquired the force of a general law makes its appearance under a similar form on each similar occasion while the other only irregularly and occasionally shews itself

\* Monosyllabic bases only have preserved the *α* as the case sign in the singular nominative (§ 137), hence स्त्री *stri-as* *femina* भूयस् *bhuas* "terras from स्त्री *stri* भू *bhū* There is scarce a doubt that this form originally extended to polysyllabic bases also, for besides the Greek the Zend also partly evinces this (§ 238) as also the circumstance that in the actual condition of the Sanskrit language the accusative plural shews, in general, an inclination to weaken itself and thus contrast itself more submissively with the imperious nominative (§ 196)

feminine gender, too, the well-sounding Ionic *a* is more suitable than *n*. In general, the Sanskrit feminines in other parts of grammar cast off the *n*, which is annexed by masculines and neuters (§. 133). Moreover, the Gothic also, in feminine *ō* bases, gives no *ns*, but it appears that *thōs* = *𐌸𐌳𐌹𐌸* *tās* (*cas*, *has*) is a pure dowry from the ancestral house, and when the feminine *i* and *u* bases in Gothic, by forms like *i-ns*, *u-ns*, assimilate themselves to the masculines, this may be regarded as a disguise of gender, or a deviation caused by the example of the masculines. The consonant bases follow the example of the Indian, but have lost the *a*, as in the nominative (§ 227), hence, *fiyand-s*, *ahman-s*, for *fiyand-as*, *ahman-as*.

238. Feminines with a short final vowel lengthen it, to compensate, as it appears, for the suppression of the *a*, thus *𐌱𐌴𐌴𐌹𐌸* *prīti-s* is formed from *prīty-as*, and *𐌲𐌴𐌹𐌸* *tanū-s* from *tanw-as*. The Greek certainly presents, in this respect, only a casual coincidence, through forms in *īs*, *ūs*, which, however, are not restricted to the feminine, and stand at the same time, in the nominative, for *i-es*, *u-es*. The Zend, like the Greek, follows in its *i* and *u* bases the analogy of the consonantal terminations, hence, *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *party-ō* (*party-aš-cha*), *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *pašv-ō* (*pašv-aš-cha*, or, with Guna, *partay-ō*, *pašav-ō*). In feminine bases in *i*, *u*, occur at times also the forms *i-s*, *u-s*, corresponding to the Sanskrit, as, *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *garī-s*, “*montes*” (Vendidād S p 313), *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *ērēzū-s*, “*rectas*,” *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *tafnū-s*, “*uientes*,” *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *pērētū-s*, “*pontes*”.

239. Masculine bases in *a*, where they are not replaced by the neuter (§ 231 Note), have, in the accusative, *an* (cf § 61), as, *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *uman*, “*hos*,” often occurs, *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *mazistan*, “*marimos*” (Vend S p 65). The sibilant is retained before the [G Ed p 277] particle *cha*, and these forms can be copiously quoted, as, *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *amēshans-cha*, “*non-*

conventesque *manthrans cha* 'sermonesque  
*aësmans cha lignoque*, *tryans cho agricolasque* The form *athau*  
*run ans-cha presbyterosque* (V S p 65) is remarkable as  
 there is no reason elsewhere to assume a theme *athouruna*  
 and this form would accordingly shew that consonantal bases  
 also could assume the inflexion *ns* with an unavoidable  
 auxiliary vowel however unless indeed we are to suppose  
 that in the perverted feeling of the language it has been  
 introduced by the preponderating analogy of the *a* bases  
 More important therefore than this *athaurunans cha* are the accusatives *näreus homines*  
 and *streus stellas* which occur very frequently,  
 while from *dtor* fire we have found not *dtireus*  
 but *dtir 6* in which it is to be remarked  
 that *dtir* distinguishes itself from other words in *r* in this  
 point also that it forms in the nominative singular not  
*dtira* but *dturs* But how is the termination *eus*  
 to be explained? I believe in no other way but from *ans*  
 by changing the *n* into a vowel as in [G Ld p 278]  
*λογους*, after which according to § 31 the *a* has be-  
 come *ε* the sibilant however which after *a* and *on*  
 is *s* must after *u* appear as *s* We actually find too  
 in the V S p 311 *nēr ans* in the sense of a dative

\* I formerly thought I could, through forms of this kind quote the  
 introduction of a euphonic *s* in 7end according to the analogy of § 95  
 But if this introduction cannot be proved by cases, in which no ground  
 exists for the assumption of an original sibilant, preserved merely by the  
 particle *cha* (cf §§ 56<sup>b</sup> 207 2 8) then the above examples are the  
 more important in order to supply a fresh proof that *ns* is the original  
 designation of masculine plural accusatives of themes terminating with a  
 vowel The superlative *tell'ra-ansima* (of which  
 hereafter) may be regarded as derived from a participial nominative Other  
 cases which might suggest occasion to assume, in Zend, a euphonic *s* after  
*n*, have been nowhere met with by me



doubt the *er*—Middle and New High German *er*—which makes its appearance in the plural in many Old High German neuters is identical with the Sanskrit neuter suffix  $\text{अस्}$  as e.g. *húsir* houses *chalpír* 'calves' (cf Grimm, pp 622 and 631) \*

212 Here follows a general view of the accusative formation

SANSKRIT	VEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
m <i>eriká n</i>	<i>erhka n</i>	$\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ,	<i>lupa s</i>	<i>uilkù s</i>	<i>vulfa ns</i>
n <i>dánā n i</i>	<i>dāta</i>	$\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ ,	<i>dona</i>		<i>daura</i>
f <i>juhéd s</i>	<i>huzá a</i>	$\chi\omega\rho\alpha\varsigma$	<i>terrū s</i>	<i>tanha s</i>	<i>gibó-s</i>
f <i>tá s</i>	<i>tá-o</i>	$\tau\alpha\text{-}\varsigma$	<i>is-tū s</i> ,	<i>ta s</i>	<i>thó s</i>
m <i>patí n</i>	<i>paity ó †</i>	$\pi\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ ,	<i>host es</i>		<i>gasti ns</i>
f <i>bhuy as</i>	<i>áfrity ó †</i>	$\pi\omicron\rho\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$	<i>mess -es</i>		
f <i>prítí s</i>	<i>ufrítí s</i>	$\pi\omicron\rho\tau\iota\varsigma$		<i>átoy-s</i>	<i>ansti ns</i>
n <i>várí n i</i>	<i>var a,</i>	$\dot{\iota}\delta\rho\iota\alpha$ ,	<i>marí a,</i>		
n	<i>hya</i>				<i>u-a</i>
f <i>bhavishyanti s</i>	<i>báshyainti s †</i>				[G Ed p 280]
m <i>sánu n,</i>	<i>pasí-ó †</i>	$\iota\chi\theta\upsilon\text{-}\alpha\varsigma$	<i>pecū s</i>	<i>sunù s,</i>	<i>sunu ns</i>
f <i>bhuv-as</i>	<i>taní-ó †</i>	$\pi\iota\tau\upsilon\alpha\varsigma$			
f <i>tanú s</i>	<i>tanú s</i>	$\pi\iota\tau\upsilon\text{-}\varsigma$ ,	<i>socrū s,</i>		<i>handu ns</i>
m <i>madhā n i</i>	<i>madhi a †</i>	$\mu\epsilon\theta\upsilon\text{-}\alpha$	<i>pecu-a,</i>		

\* This *er* however is treated in declension as if the theme originally terminated in *a* and would thus in Sanskrit be *asa*. Hence compared with the dative *húsuru m* (from *húsira m* § 169) the nom accus *húsir* appears an abbreviation. But the relation of our *er* to the Sanskrit *as* is not thereby disturbed, because in general most of the original consonantal terminations in High German have received unorganic vowel additions. Cf pp 148 and 191 G Ed Note. More regarding this hereafter.

† See p 175 G Ed Note †

‡ This form is further confirmed by  $\text{անյարկաբաժ}$  *pecó tania* from *peso tanu* which signifies the hind part of the body (§ 199) but is also used in the sense of 'blow on the hinder part of the body' and in this manner it occurs in the 16th Fargard of the Vend.  $\text{արատ զարայճա անյարկաբաժ արգայանայ աճա արգանայ ինչպէս}$  *anhat (anhat?)*  
s 2 *hac! a*

	SANSKRIT	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN	GOTHIC.
f.	<i>vadhû-s,</i>	....	....	....	....	....
m. f.	<i>gâ-s,*</i>	<i>gâu-s,</i>	<i>βό(F)-ας,</i>	<i>bov-ēs,</i>	....	....
f.	<i>nâv-as.</i>	. . .	<i>νᾱ(F)-ας,</i>	....	....	....
f.	<i>vâch-as,</i>	<i>vâch-ô,†</i>	<i>ὄπ-ας,</i>	<i>voc-ēs,</i>	....	....
m.	<i>bhai at-as,‡</i>	<i>bai ěnt-ô,†</i>	<i>φέρωντ-ας,</i>	<i>ferent-ēs,</i>	....	<i>fiyand-s.</i>
m	<i>âtman-as,</i>	<i>ašman-ô,†</i>	<i>δαίμων-ας,</i>	<i>sermon-ēs,</i>	....	<i>ahman-s.</i>
n.	<i>nāmân-i,</i>	<i>nâman-a,</i>	<i>τάλαν-α,</i>	<i>nomîn-a,</i>	....	<i>namôn-a.</i>
m.	<i>bhrâtîr-n,§</i>	<i>brâthr-eus?</i>	<i>πατέρ-ας,</i>	<i>fratr-es,</i>	....	....
f.	<i>duhitîr-s,§</i>	<i>dughdhēr-eus?</i>	<i>θυγατέρ-ας,</i>	<i>matr-es,</i>	<i>duhter-ιs,</i>	.. .
m.	<i>dâtîr-n,§</i>	<i>dâthr-eus?</i>	<i>δοτήρ-ας,</i>	<i>datōr-ēs,</i>	....	....
n.	<i>vachâns-i,</i>	<i>vachanh-a,</i>	<i>ἔπε(σ)-α,</i>	<i>oper-a,</i>	....	....

## THE INSTRUMENTAL.

[G Ed p 281] 243 The formation of this case, and what is connected with it, has been already explained in §§. 215 224 , it is therefore sufficient to give here a comparison of the forms which correspond to one another in the cognate languages,

*hacha skyaothnâ-varēza atha buvanti pēšô-tanva*, “*hac pro facti-peractione tum sunt verbera posteriori corpori inflata*” (Anquetil, *Celui qui commet cette action sera coupable du tanafour*) In regard to the *anâpēretha*, mentioned at § 232, it is further to be noticed that the *ḡ th* can only be occasioned by a *œ w* that has been dropped (§ 47 ), for the theme of the concluding substantive is *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 pēřetu*, not *pēřethu* (Vend S pp. 313 and 362, twice)

\* Irregularly from a theme *𐬕𐬀 gâ* (§ 122 ), for *𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 gav-as* The Zend *𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 gâus* (also *𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 gâos*), which often occurs, rests on the strengthened Sanskrit form *𐬕𐬀 gâu*, so that in respect of the strong and weak cases (§ 129 ), the relation in this word is distorted In the nominative, for instance, we should expect *𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 gâus*, and in the accusative *𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 geus*, rather than *vice versa*

† See p 163, Note †

‡ See § 129

§ See §. 127. Note and §. 249. Note †





frequency, but the middle step *i-bus* is wanting; yet the language has scarcely made the spring from *a-bus* at once to *i-s*, but *a-bus* has weakened the *a* of the base to *ī*, which, to compensate for the *bu* which has been dropped, has been lengthened, thus *terrī-s* from *terrī-bus*, for *terra-bus*, as [G. Ed p 283.] *mālo* from *māvolo* Compare,

SANSKRIT.	ZEND	LATIN	LITHUANIAN.
m <i>vikê-bhyas</i> ,	<i>īchraēi-byō</i> ,	<i>hupē-s.</i> *	<i>uilka-m(u)s</i> †
f <i>jhuā-bhyas</i> ,	<i>hiziā-byō</i> ,	<i>terrī-s</i> ,	<i>ranko-m(u)s</i>
m <i>pati-bhyas</i> ,	<i>paiti-byō</i> ,	<i>hosti-bus</i> ,	. . †
f. <i>prīti-bhyas</i> ,	<i>āfrīti-byō</i> ,	<i>messi-bus</i> ,	<i>au-i-m(u)s</i> .
m <i>bharīshyantī-bhyas</i> ,	<i>bāshyanti-byō</i> ,	.	. . .
m. <i>sīnū-bhyas</i> ,	<i>pašu-byō</i> ,	<i>pecu-bus</i> , †	<i>sunu-m(u)s</i> ,
f. <i>īāg-bhyas</i> ,	<i>īāh-e-byō</i> ,	<i>roc-i-bus</i>	. . . .
m <i>bharad-bhyas</i> ,	<i>barēn-byō</i> , §	<i>ferent-i-bus</i> ,	. . .
m. <i>ātma'-bhyas</i> ,	<i>aśma'-byō</i> ,	<i>sermon-i-bus</i> ,	. .
m. <i>bhrātri-bhyas</i> ,	<i>brātar-ē-byō</i> ,	<i>fratr-i-bus</i> ,	.

#### THE GENITIVE.

245. The genitive plural in Sanskrit, in substantives and adjectives, has the termination *ām*, in the Zend *anm*, according to § 61. The Greek *ων* bears the same relation to the original form of the termination that *ἐδίδων* does to *ἀδιδάμ* (§§ 4. 10) The Latin has, as usual,

\* See § 215

† The masculine *i* bases pass in the plural, by an unorganic increment, into a different declension. And in the dual and dative singular, also, *PATI* had to be given up (Mielcke, p 35, Rem 1)

‡ I have selected the masculine base *PECU*, which occurs only in a few cases, on account of its connection with *𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀* *pašu*, and I have carried it through all the cases, and think, therefore, that I may here also give the original *u-bus* for the corruption *i-bus*

§ See § 224 Note \*, p 241

preserved the labial final nasal in its original form but by its influence has shortened the preceding vowel, hence *pedum* (= *padam*) the *u* of which supplies the place of a short *a* as in *lupum* = वृकम् *urikam* लुकोः \* [C Ed p 981] The German like the Lithuanian, has dropped the final nasal. In Gothic however the *and* which has been left, shows itself under two forms and thereby an unorganic difference has been introduced between the feminine genitive termination and that of the masculine neuter since the fuller *o* has remained only to the feminine *o* and *n* bases.

216 Bases ending with *n* vowel with the exception partly necessary and partly arbitrary of monosyllables place in Sanskrit a euphonic *n* between the termination and the base the final vowel of which if short is lengthened. This interposition appears to be pristine since the Zend partakes of it although in a more limited degree for instance in all bases in *o a* and *o d* hence *वरुणानाम्* *urukā n-nam* *जिह्वानाम्* *jihvā n-nam*. To the latter correspond very remarkably the genitives (which occur in Old High German Old Saxon and Anglo Saxon in the

\* Regarding the termination *fum* in consonantal bases and vice versa respecting *um* in places where *fum* might have been expected we refer the reader to § 126. In adjectives the feminine character mentioned in § 113 may have had its effect and may have passed over from the feminine to the other genders, according to the analogy of the Lithuanian (p. 124 Note \* § 157) thus the *offerenti-um* reminds us of the Sanskrit feminine भरन्ति *bharanti*. The same is the case with the *s* of the neuter form *ferenti-a* it is bequeathed to the deceased feminine then *ERLÄUT.* On the other hand contrary to the opinion preferred in § 126, we must now regard the *i* before *lus* (e.g. *ecolus*) as a conjunctive vowel like the *e* in the 7th *let e by*. Here it is to be observed that those consonantal bases, which admit neither *a* nor *i-um*, must nevertheless proceed before *bus* to announce *n*. In the chapter upon the adjectives we shall recur to the feminine character *s* and then treat also of the *i* for *e* in the singular ablative of the common dialect.

corresponding class of words) in *ô-n-ô*, *e-n-a*; hence, Old High German *lepô-n-ô*, Old Saxon *gebô-n-ô*, Anglo-Saxon *gife-n-a*.

247 We find the bases in short and long *i*, in Zend, if [G Ed p 285] polysyllabic, only with euphonic *n* on the other hand the monosyllabic *i* bases annex the termination direct, either attaching Guna to the final vowel, or keeping it pure, thus, *thay anm* or *thray-anm*, "*trium*," from *thri*, *vay-anm*, "*avum*," from *vi*. Bases in *y* or *u* admit both of the annexing the termination direct and of the insertion of the euphonic *n*, but I find from the masculine *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 paśu* only *paśv-anm* on the other hand, I have found from feminine bases like *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 tanu*, "body," *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 naśu*, "corpse" (cf *νέκυς* according to § 21), hitherto only *u-n-anm*. With Guna *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 paśav-anm* would serve as a prototype for the Gothic *suniv-ê* with Guna weakened (§. 27).

248 Pronouns of the third person have, in Sanskrit, *साम् sām\** for *आम् ām*, and this may be the original and formerly universal form of the case-suffix, so that *ām* would properly be only the termination of the termination, and the *s* connected with the genitive singular would be the chief person. If this is the case, the abbreviation of this termination in substantives and adjectives must still be recognised as very ancient, for the Gothic, which in the plural nominative restricts itself so rigorously to the old limits (§. 228), gives to the sibilant, in the genitive also, no wider scope, hence *thi-zê* (§. 86 5) = *te-shām* (for *tê-sām*, according to § 21) "*horum*," *thi-zo* = *tâ-sām*, "*harum*." Here the *a*, like the *ô* of the base *TIIA*, *THÔ*, appears weakened to *i* (§ 66) on the other hand, the adjective *a* and *ô* bases, which follow the pronominal declension, have *ai-zê*, *ai-zô*, and *blindai-zê*, "*cæcorum*" (for *binda-zê*), answers exactly to the Sanskrit *तेषाम् te-śhām*

\* Cf Old Prussian *son*, e g. in *stei-son*, "τὸν."

(from *taī sām*) from the base  $\pi ta$  The High German has changed the old sibilant to  $r$  as in many other places hence in Old High German *de-rō* for *thi sē* and *thi sō* of which termination only the  $r$  has remained [G Ed p 286] to us To the Latin in like manner belongs *rum* for *sum* (§ 27) hence *istorum istarum* \*

249 We give here a general view of the formation of the genitive

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOTHIC
m	<i>īri ā n-am</i>	<i>īehrka n anm</i>	λυκ ωι,	<i>lupo-rum</i>	<i>wilk ā</i>	<i>vulf ē</i>
m	<i>n te shām</i>	<i>taē shanm,</i>	τ ων	<i>isto rum,</i>	<i>t ā</i>	<i>thi ē</i>
f	<i>jihuxi n am</i>	<i>hi-wa n aum</i>	χωρα ων	<i>terrū rum</i>	<i>rank ā</i>	<i>keþō n ō †</i>

\* This *rum*, however, has, like the property of the plural nominative (§ 28) "found its way or returned from the pronominal declension into the entire second, first and fifth declension, which is originally identical with the latter (§§ 121 and 137) The transplanting of the *rum* termination into the declensions mentioned was the easier as all pronouns in the genitive plural belong to the second and first declension Forms, however remain especially in the old languages, which evince that the language was not always equally favorable to the bringing back the termination *rum* (*deum socium amphorum drachmum agricolum* &c) On the other hand, the termination *rum* appears also to have attempted to fix itself in consonantal bases with *e* as conjunctive vowel if at least the forms furnished by Varro and Charis—*boverum Joverum lapiderum regerum nucerum* (Hartung p 205)—are to be regarded as correct and do not perhaps stand for *boio-rum* &c as also in Zend the base *go* may extend itself to *gāa* The Latin *rum* and Sanskrit साम *sām* lead us to expect the Greek σων this is not met with however even in the pronoun so that the Greek in this respect stands in the strongest opposition to the Latin The forms in α ων ε ων (*ε γ α τ ω αντ ων αγ ρ ων αγ ορ ω*) point however to a consonant that has been dropped It is a question, therefore whether universally a  $\Sigma$  (cf § 128) or as the Sanskrit and Zend lead us to expect only in pronouns a  $\Sigma$  but in other words of the first and second declension en N has been dropped as in  $\mu ι ζ ω$  from  $\mu ζ ν α$  According to this  $\lambda κ ω ν$  would be to be derived from  $\lambda κ ο ν ω ν$   $\chi ω ρ α ω ν$  from  $\chi ω ρ α ν ω ν$  but  $\tau ω ν$  from  $\tau ε σ ω ν$   $\tau ω ν$  from  $\tau ε σ ω ν$

† Old High German, see § 246

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND	GREEK.	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOTHIC
f.	<i>tā-sām</i> ,	<i>ā-onhanm</i> ,	<i>τά-ων</i> ,	<i>islā-rum</i> ,	<i>t'-ū</i> ,	<i>thu-zō</i> .
[G Ed p 287.] m. n.	<i>tray-ā-nām</i> ,	<i>thray-anm</i> ,	<i>τρι-ὦν</i> ,	<i>tri-um</i> ,	<i>tri-ū</i> ,	<i>thruy-ē</i>
f	<i>prītī-n-ām</i> ,	<i>āfrīti-n-anm</i> ,	<i>πορτίων</i> ,	<i>messi-um</i> ,	<i>awi-ī</i> ,	<i>anst'-e</i>
m.	<i>sūnū-n-ām</i> ,	<i>pašv-anm</i> ,	<i>ἰχθύ-ων</i> ,	<i>pecu-um</i> ,	<i>sun'-ū</i> ,	<i>sunu-ē</i>
f.	<i>tanū-n-ām</i> ,	<i>tanu-n-anm</i> ,	<i>πιτύ-ων</i> ,	<i>socru-um</i> ,	....	<i>handiv-ē</i> .
m. f.	<i>gav-ām</i> ,	<i>gav-anm</i> ,	<i>βο(F)ῶν</i> ,	<i>bov-um</i> ,	.. .	.. .
f.	<i>nā-ūām</i> ,	....	<i>να(F)-ῶν</i> ,	....	....	.. .
f	<i>vāch-ām</i> ,	<i>vāch-anm</i> ,	<i>ὀπ-ῶν</i> ,	<i>voc-um</i> ,	....	...
m. n.	<i>bharat-ām</i> ,	<i>barēnt-anm</i> ,†	<i>φερόντων</i> ,	<i>ferenti-um</i> ,	....	<i>frvand-ē</i> .
m.	<i>ātman-ām</i> ,	<i>ašman-anm</i> ,	<i>δαίμόν-ων</i> ,	<i>sermon-um</i> ,	<i>akmen-ū</i> ,	<i>ahman-ē</i> .
m.	<i>bhrātī-n-ām</i> ,	<i>bī āthr-anm</i> ,‡	<i>πατέρ-ων</i> ,	<i>fratr-um</i> ,	.. .	....

\* This word often occurs, and corresponds to the Sanskrit *असाम ā-sām* "harum," "earum" (§ 56<sup>b</sup>), from *स्य ता, tāonhanm* would be expected, which I am unable to quote. The compound (polysyllabic) pronominal bases shorten the last syllable but one; hence, *अतानहानम at-tanhanm* not *aētāonhanm*, as might be expected from *असाम etā-sām*.

† Or, also, *बारान्तानम barantanm*, as in the Vendidad Sade, p 131, *साओचान्तानम šaochantanm*, "lucentum" on the other hand, also, frequently *šaochantanm*.

‡ This and the following genitives from bases in *ar* are clearly more genuine, and are more nearly allied therefore to the cognate European languages than the corresponding ones in Sanskrit, which, in this case, has shortened *ar* to *ari*, and has then treated it according to the analogy of vowels. From *अर nar* frequently occurs *nar-anm*, with retention of the *a*, on account of the base being monosyllabic. On the other hand, *अथार anm* from *atar*, "fire," and *अथार anm* "trium," fem for the Sanskrit *अथार anm* (Gramm. Crit r 255). From *अथार anm* *dughdhar*, we find the form *dughdhēr-anm* (cf p 208, G Ed Note †) the Codex has, however, *अथार anm* (p 472, L 2). In general, in this word the readings *dughdhar* *blindā-ē*, are interchanged in various passages the former, however, common.

## LOCATIVE

250 The character of the plural locative [G Ed p 203] is in Sanskrit सु सु which is subject to be changed into यु रु ( § 21 ) for which in Zend is found शु ( § 50 ) while from सु सु according to § 53 has been formed हु hu The more usual form for शु and हु (for which also occur शु and हु) is however शुश शुश हुश हुश which leads to a Sanskrit ससृश This appears to me to be the original form of the termination for nothing is more common in Sanskrit than that the syllables यश and यश should free themselves from their vowel, and then change the semi vowel into a vowel as उल ul is said for ल (see also § 12) The supposition therefore of the Indian abbreviation of the termination is far more probable than that of a Zend extension of it by a lately-added a especially as in no other case does a similar aftergrowth admit of being established But if ससृश is the original form of the termination it is then identical with the reflexive possessive base ससृश of which more hereafter \* The same relation which in Latin tu bi has to su bi (which might be conjectured from su i) or that ti bi has to tu bi Sanskrit तुभ्यम् tu bhyam the Greek dative locative termination σι (σιν) has to the Sanskrit सु सु †

Therefore in Zend the locative शुश शुश "in tribus" is identical with शुश शुश trishas the third part since the pronoun in the latter compound denotes the idea of part

† Regarding the termination ω of the pronoun of the 1st and 2d person see § 200 From the Tohe form μμωω quoted by Hartung (1860) from Apoll I cannot infer that ω is an abbreviation of σ ω if it were so the α in ημ would not adhere so firmly It appears to me more suitable, therefore to accord to the common declension an influence upon the transformation of the form of inflexion peculiar to the pronouns without gender but of the highest antiquity, an influence which has penetrated further in σφ σι for σφ ω

[G. Ed p. 289] 251. The bases in अ *a* add to that vowel, as in many other cases, an *i*; but from *a + i* is formed ए *é* (§. 2), to which the Greek *oi* corresponds; hence, लύκοι-σι = वृकेशु *vríkê-shu*. Hence the *i* in Greek has also passed over to the bases in *α*-, *η*-, either preserving its full value or subscribed, while in Sanskrit the अ *a* remains pure; hence, गृहवासु *gṛhwâ-su*, with which the locatives of names of towns best agree, as Πλαταιᾶσιν, Ὀλυμπιάσι, Ἀθήνησι (Buttmann, §. 116. R. 7. and Hartung, p. 461.)

252. Like the Gothic, the Lithuanian has an unorganic difference between the terminations which mark the case in the masculine and feminine in the genitive plural the first has the sound of *se*, and the latter of *sa*, with the original and more powerful *a*, which, in the masculine, has softened into *e*. The ending *sa* is plainly from the *swa*, assumed above (p 267, l. 7.) to be the original form, from which it is made by rejecting the semi-vowel.

253. Here follows a general view of the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian plural locatives, with the Greek datives

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUAN	GREEK
m.	vríkê-shu,	vêlrkaê-shva,	uilkû-se,	λύκοι-σι
[G. Ed p 290] f.	gṛhwâ-su,	hizvâ-hva,	ranko-sa,	Ὀλυμπιάσι, χώραι-σι.
f.	prîti-shu,	âfrîti-shva,†	âwi-sa,	πόρτι-σι
m.	sûnu-shu,	paşu-shva,	dangû-se,	ἰχθύ-σι.
m. f	go-shu,	....	....	βου-σί.
f.	nau-shu,	....	. . .	ναυ-σί.

\* The common termination *ois*, *aïs* (*oi-s*, *ai-s*), formed by curtailing *oi-si*, *ai-si*, and so brought into agreement of sound with the third declension, is here lost, through its apparent connection with the Sanskrit curtailed instrumental ending ऐस् *âis* (§ 219), which had before required consideration, because the Greek dative is also used as the instrumental

† I have no authority for the locative of the Zend bases in *i*, but it can only be analogous to that of the bases in *u*, which can be referred to in copious instances

SANSKRIT	Zend	LITHUAN	GREEK
f iāḥ shu	iāc-sia?		οι σι
m n bharat su	brātar e shia?		φερου σι
m ālma su	asma -hva *		δαιμο-σι
m bhrātri shu			πατρα σι †
n iachas su	iachō hva ‡		ἔπεσ σι

\* Thus in the Vend Sade p 499 *uṣahia* from *uṣan* and p 500 *damaḥia*, from *dāman*

† The *a* in this form is not as is generally supposed, a conjunctive vowel but rests on a transposition as *δρα ν* for *δρακον*, and in Sanskrit *द्रक्ष्यामि drakshyāmi* 'I will see' for *दृक्ष्यामि dṛakshyāmi* (Sansk Gramm § 34b) thus *πατρ σι* (compare *τρ σι*) for *παταρσ* (compare *σσρσ*) which by preserving the original vowel agrees with the Sanskrit base *pitar* better than *πατρ πα πατερες* &c. The same applies to the dative *αυ σι* since the theme of *πρσ* has as appears from the cognate word *ρη*, *αρην αρην*, rejected a vowel between the *ρ* and *ν* which again appears in the dative plural in the form of an *a*, and removed from its place. The whole *REA* appears to be a transposition of *Λετ* Sanskrit *नृ nar* (*नृन्*) 'a man, for *ρην* properly means "male sheep" The *a* of *ρ σι* is therefore etymologically identical with that of *αυδρ σι* (comp Kühner's complete Greek Grammar § 981 Rem 2) It is more difficult to give any accurate account of the *a* of *ν σι* it is either the older and stronger form for the *οι σι* or this word must have had, besides its three themes (*YIO*, *YI* *YIEY*) a fourth *YIAT* from which came *ν ασ* as *γ ασ* from *ΓONAT* the more prevailing *co* theme of *ΓONY* which latter agrees with *जानु janu*

‡ In the Vendidad Sade p 499 we find the analogous plural locatives *uzirohia* and *esapohia*. Anquetil translates the former by 'au lever du sol il' and the latter by 'à la nuit'. It is impossible to pronounce these forms aught but derivatives from themes in *as* (*हो* § 56b). Most of the cases of the latter word, which occurs very frequently in various forms, spring from a theme in *as*, and the interchange of *esapar* with *esapo* is a similar case to that in Sanskrit, where *अहन् ahan* "day" forms some cases from *अहस् ahas* (from which *अहो aho* in *अहोभिस् ahobhis* &c), and together with





in most important particulars is adopted by Thiersch § 128 for the development of the forms in *εσσι* only that he with draws from the neuter bases described in § 128 as *ΒΕΛΕΣ* the *Σ* which belongs to them and by a supposition proved to be erroneous *ΒΕΛΕ* is made the theme and he divides forms like *ῥχεςφι* into *ῥχε σφι* instead of *ῥχες φι* and, by assimilation derives *ῥχε σσι* from *ῥχε σφι* while as I believe I have proved the forms *ῥχες φι* and *ῥχεςσι* rest on entirely different case suffixes (§ 218) and have only the base *ΟΥΕΣ* in common with one another. An assimilation, however may be remarked in *γουναςσι* from *γουνας φι* so that the first letter has assimilated itself to the second not the reverse. In *δεπαςσι* we shall leave it undecided whether the first *Σ* be primitive, and *ΔΕΠΑΣ* the theme (comp *γῆρας* § 128) or whether it has arisen out of *τ* and so *ΔΕΠΑΣ* with *ΤΕΡΑΣ* *ΚΕΡΑΣ* belong to one class. If,

*csapan* but that it is preceded (V S p 163) by the unequivocal adjective locative *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 naēmē* (from *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 naēma* half). Compare also I c § 149 where *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓 𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓 iθra aīnē iθra*, *csafnē* probably means in this day in the night with the locative adverb *𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓 iθra* 'here' in the sense of a locative demonstrative. To the theme *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 csafna* the plural of the same sound *csafna* might also be assigned which occurs I c §§ 330 331 and in several places elsewhere *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓 thrayo csafna* 'three night' *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓 csafna* six night *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓 csafna* nine night if here *csafna* be not (as in § 231 Note † it was considered to be) rather to be taken for the plural of *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓 csapan*, as neuter since as has been before observed the Zend uses the gender of the substantive with great laxity especially in the plural. For the frequently occurring ablative *𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓 csaparāt* however we cannot assume another theme *csapara* but we must if the reading be correct admit that feminine consonantal roots in the ablative adopt also the broader ending *āt* for *at*.

however, in all these forms, we allow only  $\sigma\iota$  or  $\sigma\iota\nu$  to be the case-suffix, and all that precedes it is referred to the true or unorganic increase of the base, it can therewith not be denied that not even to Homer himself, in forms like  $\epsilon\pi\sigma\sigma\iota$ , not to mention unorganic forms like  $\kappa\upsilon\nu\sigma\sigma\iota$ , did the entire  $\sigma\sigma\iota$  present

[G Ed p 293] itself as pertaining to that which marked the case, for in the feeling of the speaker  $\epsilon\pi\sigma\sigma\iota$  could present itself, during that period of the language, only as what it is, namely, as  $\epsilon\pi\sigma\sigma\iota$ , while  $\epsilon\pi\sigma\sigma\sigma$ ,  $\epsilon\pi\sigma\sigma\iota$ , plural  $\epsilon\pi\sigma\sigma\alpha$  and not  $\epsilon\pi\sigma\sigma$ , &c., were used in declension. But different from what has been here adopted is the assumption of Hartung (p 260, ff.) and Kuhner (l. c. §. 255. R. 8), in the most material points following Greg. Cor. *Æol.* § 35., relative to the production of the Greek plural datives. Kuhner says (l. c) "The character of the dative plural is  $\epsilon\varsigma$  (character of the plural) and  $\iota$  or  $\iota\nu$  (character of the dative singular), therefore,  $\sigma\sigma\iota(\nu)$ " I, however, think  $\epsilon\varsigma$  not the character of number, but of the nominative plural, and connected with the nominative singular through its  $\Sigma$  a union of the plural nominative suffix with the singular dative is, to me, not to be imagined. If it were so, how could neuter nouns, to which  $\epsilon\varsigma$  in the nominative is quite foreign, arrive, in the dative, at their identity of form with the natural sexes? It further deserves to be remarked, that, in Prâkrit, the locative ending  $\text{सु} su$  frequently assumes an Anuswâra, and so adapts itself, by the form  $\text{सुं} sun$ , for  $su$ , to the Greek,  $\sigma\iota\nu$ , for  $\sigma\iota$

254. After laying down the laws of the formation of a single case, it may serve to facilitate the general survey if examples are adduced of the most important classes of words in their connected declension. We pass over here from the Sanskrit, and go to the other languages in their order, according as they have, in the particular cases, most truly preserved their original form, and where one or other of them has departed entirely from the original

principle of formation or by an unorganic increase to the base has entered the province of another declension we there in the place in question exclude it from the comparison

MASCULINE BASES IN *a*, GREEK IN *o* LATIN IN *u o*

SINGULAR

Nominative	Sanskrit <i>vrika s</i> Lithuanian <i>vilka s</i> Zend <i>vehrk o</i> with <i>cha</i> <i>vehrkas cha</i> Greek <i>λυκο s</i> Latin <i>lupu s</i> Gothic <i>vulf s</i> *
Accusative	Sanskrit <i>vrikam</i> Lithua [G Ed p 294] nian <i>vilka n</i> Zend <i>vehrke-m</i> Greek <i>λυκο :</i> Latin <i>lupu-m</i> Gothic <i>vulf</i>
Instrumental	Sanskrit <i>vrike na</i> Zend <i>vehrka</i> Gothic Dat <i>vulfa</i> Lithuanian Instr <i>vilku</i>
Dative	Sanskrit <i>vrikāya</i> Zend <i>vehrkād</i> Lithuanian <i>vilku</i>
Ablative	Sanskrit <i>vrika t</i> Zend <i>vehrkād t</i> Latin <i>lup o(d)</i> (see § 191)
Genitive	Sanskrit <i>vrika sua</i> Greek <i>λυκο-(σ)ιο†</i> Zend <i>vehrka hé</i> Gothic <i>vulfi s</i> Lithuanian <i>vilko</i>

\* The meaning is in all these languages the same and so is the theme in its first origin. The connection of the Lithuan *vilkas* with *vrikas* rests on the very usual interchange of the semi vowels *r* and *l* and this latter goes through the whole of the European sister languages. The Gothic *vulfs* shows moreover the equally common interchange of gutturals and labials and follows the rule for the alteration of letters (Asp for Tenuis see § 87). In Latin the same thing takes place with regard to the supply of the guttural by the corresponding labial but *lupus* is further altered through the loss of the initial letter *P* as is the Greek *λυκο s* it may however be assumed that this *ι* is introduced into the middle of the word in being vocalized into *u*. While therefore in Lithuanian in *vilkas* *l* and *k* are united they are in Greek separated by

† M Reimnitz whose pamphlet *The System of Greek Declension* (Potsdam 1831) had not been seen by me before I completed the preceding Part of this book unfolds (I c p 123 *passim*) the same views concerning

Locative,	Sanskrit <i>vrikā</i> (from <i>vrika</i> + <i>i</i> ), Zend <i>vřhikā</i> [G. Ed p 295] ( <i>maidhyā</i> , § 196), Lithuanian <i>uilkā</i> , Greek Dat. <i>λόροι</i> ( <i>οἴροι</i> § 195.) Latin Gen <i>lup'ī</i>
Vocative,	Sanskrit <i>vrika</i> , Zend <i>vřhika</i> , Lithuanian <i>uilkī</i> , Greek <i>λόκι</i> , Latin <i>lupē</i> , Gothic <i>ulf</i>

## DUAL

Nom Acc.Voc	Sanskrit <i>vrikāu</i> , Vedic <i>vrikā</i> , Zend <i>vřhrkā</i> , Lith. Nom. <i>uilkū</i> , Voc. <i>uilkū</i> , Greek <i>λόκω</i>
Instl Dat Abl	Sanskrit <i>vrikā-bhyām</i> , Zend <i>vřhrkān-bya</i> , Greek Dat Gen <i>λόκο-ν</i> , Lithuanian Dat <i>uilkā-m</i> (see § 215)
Gen Loc	Sansk <i>vrikay-ōs</i> , Zend <i>vřhikay-ō</i> (see Rem. 1), Lithuanian <i>uilkū</i>

## PLURAL

Nom. Voc.	Sanskrit <i>vrikās</i> , Gothic <i>ulfōs</i> *
Accusative,	Sanskrit <i>vrikā-n</i> , Zend <i>vřhrkā-n</i> , Goth <i>ulfa-ns</i> , Greek <i>λόκο-ς</i> (from <i>λόκο-ις</i> , §. 236.), Lithu- aman <i>uilkūs</i> , Latin <i>lupō-s</i>

the Greek *οιο* and its connection with the Sanskrit *a-sya* which I have, without being aware of his concurrence, brought forward in § 180 I have, however, in this respect, already stated my views in my pamphlet "On the Demonstrative and the Origin of Case" (in the Transactions of the Hist Phil Class of the Academy of Science of Berlin for the year 1826, p 100 Here I have only further to observe, that the Greek *οι* δημόσιος, from the root ΔΗΜΟ, is, in the suffix by which it is formed, probably connected with the genitive ending in the text; and is therefore remarkable with reference to the preservation of the *s*, which is lost in *δήμοιο* With regard to the origin of δημόσιος from the genitive, let reference be made to the Latin *cujus*, *a*, *um*, and the identity of the Sanskrit suffix of words like मनुष्य *manushya*, "man," as a derivative from Manu, with the genitive ending य *shya* for स्य *sya*, as in अमुष्य *amu-shya*, "illus"

\* With reference to the Zend, see § 231 Note†; and with regard to the Greek, Latin, and Lithuanian forms *λόκοι*, *lupi*, *uilkai*, see § 228

Instrumental,	Sanskrit <i>vrīḍa</i> is* (from <i>vrīḍa bhū</i> ) Veda <i>īrikē bhū</i> Zend <i>vehrkād-is</i> Lithuanian <i>uīlka is</i> Prakrit <i>dece-hin</i> (from <i>dēva</i> God see § 220) Greek <i>θεο φη</i> † Gothic Dat Instr <i>uulfa m</i> (§ 215)
Dat Abl	Sanskrit <i>īrikē bhūyas</i> Zend [G Ed p 296] <i>vehrkaei byō</i> Latin <i>lupi s</i> ( <i>amicī bus</i> § 244) Lithuanian <i>uīlka m(n)s</i> (§ 215)
Genitive	Sanskrit <i>īrikā nām</i> Zend <i>vehrka nānm</i> Greek <i>λук ω</i> Lithuanian <i>nīlk u</i> Gothic <i>uulf ē</i> Latin <i>lupo rum</i> (§ 213)

\* I take the liberty, in order to separate the base and the termination to divide the diphthongs as above in *λук s* therefore one must here pronounce *īrikāis* and in Lithuanian *uīlka is* not as trisyllables, but as dissyllables

† I have remarked at § 217 but only as a conjecture that the ending *φ* in the plural is perhaps identical with the Sanskrit *भिसु* *bhis* and the thence derived Prakrit *हिन* and the Latin *bis* in *nobis* *vobis* and I will not advance more than a conjecture here also in comparing *θεο φη* with *dēce hin*. Thus only is certain that with the syllable *भि* *bhi* which in Sanskrit lies at the bottom of the case forms *भिसु* *bhis* *भ्यम्* *bhyam* and *भ्याम्* *bhyām*, as their common root (see § 215 *passim*) the Greek *φ* and *φ* is also to be associated. I here willingly agree with M Ag Bernary (Berl Ann July 1833 p 51) that *φ* might be formed from the ending *भ्यम्* *bhyam* (§ 222) by the contraction of *या* into *i* (as in *ημν* *μ* *τ* *ν* &c § 222). The third possible supposition would be the derivation from the usual dative ablative plural termination *भ्यस्* *bhyas* again with the corruption of *s* to *ν* as in the 1st person plural *μν* from *μ s* and in the 2d and 3d person *τ* *το* from *यस्* *thas* *तस्* *tas*. The fourth possible case would be the derivation from the dual termination *भ्याम्* *bhyām* (§ 215) and the changing thus number of restricted plurality to that of unlimited plurality. I prefer however to consider *φ* (*φ*) as from one of the multifarious terminations of the Sanskrit plural belonging to all declensions therefore from *भिसु* *bhis* or *भ्यम्* *bhyas*.

Locative, Sanskrit *nikê-shu*, Zend *vêhrkaê-shva*, Lithuanian *willkûse*, Greek Dat. *λύκοι-σι*

NEUTER BASES IN *a*, GREEK *o*, LATIN *u*, *o*.

SINGULAR

Nom. Acc Sanskrit *dâna-m*, Zend *dâtê-m*, Latin *donu-m*,  
Greek *δῶρο-ν*, Lithuanian *géra*, Gothic *daur'*.  
Vocative, Sanskrit *dâna*, Zend *dâta*, Gothic *daur'*.  
The rest as the masculine

DUAL

Nom. Acc. Voc Sanskrit *dâné* (from *dâna* + *i*), Zend *dâtê*.  
The rest as the masculine.

[G Ed p 297 ]

PLURAL

Nom. Acc Voc Sanskrit *dânâ-n-i*, Vêdic *dânâ*, Zend *dâta*, Latin *dona*, Greek *δῶρα*, Gothic *dawna*.  
The rest as the masculine

“Remark 1 —The Zend system of declension has received some valuable additions from the treatises published by Burnouf since the appearance of the First Part of this book, which I must lay before my readers.\* First a dual case, viz the genitive-locative, which I imagined to be lost in the Zend, as I had searched for it alone in vain, and could supply all the other dual endings in tolerable copiousness. M Burnouf supplies this (*Yasna, Notes et éclaircissements*, p cxxii) by the expressions  $\text{𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌}$  *ubôyô anhvô* which are to be twice found in V S p 312, and on both occasions are rendered by Anquetil, whose

\* First, a review of this Part in the *Journal des Savans*, which refers particularly to the Zend, then the First Part of the First Volume of a Commentary on the Yagna, lastly, a disquisition in the *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, “*Sur les mots Zends et Sanscrits Vahista et Vasichita, et sur quelques superlatifs en Zend*”

translation is in this place particularly confused *dans ce monde*. This translation might lead us astray so much the more easily that  $\text{अम्बुः}$  *ambho* according to § 187 might also be the singular genitive which frequently occurs with a locative meaning. We await the elucidation which Neriosingh's Sanskrit translation will give of this passage but for the present content ourselves with the inferences deduced by Burnouf  $\text{अम्बुः}$  *uboyō* according to that authority corresponds with the Sanskrit  $\text{अम्बासु}$  *ubhayos* (*amborum in ambobus*) with *ō* for *a* probably according to Burnouf's acute conjecture through the influence of the preceding *b* and with the loss of the concluding *s*. I am the more inclined to assent to Burnouf's opinion regarding the origin of the first *ō* of  $\text{अम्बुः}$  *ubōyō* as I have been so fortunate as to find another example for the hitherto missing dual case in which  $\text{अम्बुः}$  *nyō* not  $\text{अम्बुः}$  *ōyō* actually occurs because that is to say no letter exercising the force of assimilation in question precedes the *a*—I mean the form  $\text{अम्बास्तयौ}$  *zastnyō* (= Sanskrit *hastayos*) in the hands from  $\text{अस्तयौ}$  *zasta* [G F d p 98] in a passage of the Jzeshne which has perhaps not yet been examined by M Burnouf (V S p 351)  $\text{अम्बास्तयौ अश्वौ द्रुजं द्यान्म अस्तयौ}$  *ānthā ashāu druḥm dyanm -astayo* \* which Anquetil (p 192) translates by *Comment moi pur mettrais je le main sur le Daroudj*? It appears however that  $\text{अम्बास्तयौ}$  *ashāu* can as little be a nominative as  $\text{अम्बास्तयौ}$  *zastayō* a singular accusative and I believe I am not wrong in the following literal translation. How can I give the (Demon) Drudj into the hands of the pure (into the power)?

Remark 2—In the instrumental singular M Burnouf admits the termination *ana* in bases in *a* (Yaçna p 98 passim) with *n* introduced for the sake of euphony

\* The Codex has faultily  $\text{अम्बास्तयौ}$  *astāu* and  $\text{अश्वौ द्रुजं}$  *drujem*



according to the analogy of the Sanskrit *मृशेना* (§. 158.). He rests this, among other forms, on that of *मृशमान* *maśmana*, “*urind*,” a word which had often attracted my attention, and from which I, in like manner, would have deduced instrumentals in *a-n-a* if I had not differed from Burnouf in the etymology of the same, as I make its theme terminate in *n*; and this word, which I remember to have seen only in the instrumental, I derive from the Sanskrit root *मृश्* *mih*, “*mingere*,” by a suffix *मन्* *man*, according to the analogy of *बर्धमान* *barēśman*, from *वृध्* *vih*, “*to grow*,” whose instrumental *बर्धमान* *barēśmana*, analogous with *मृशमान* *maśmana*, occurs very frequently. M. Burnouf appears, on the other hand, to adopt a suffix *ma* in the word *maśmana*, in which we think we cannot agree with him as long as we cannot supply any cases which must indubitably belong to a theme in *a*. If, further, some words, which in their theme terminate in *as* (ॡ, Sanskrit *अस्* *as*), adopt *ana* in the instrumental form M. Burnouf quotes, p. 100 note, *मज्जाना* *mazana*, *श्रयाना* *śrayana*, and *रान्हाना* *raṇhana*; still, in my opinion, bases in *a* may be assigned as the origin of these forms, and they can be divided *maza-na*, &c., only in as far as such forms have been already proved to belong to undoubted bases in *a*. But now we prefer dividing them *mazan-a*, so that the letter *s*, with which these themes originally terminate, is interchanged with a nasal, just as,

[G Ed p 299] in Sanskrit, the words *यकित्* *yakrit*, *शकित्* *śakrit* change their *t* for *n* in the weak cases, and may substitute *यकन्* *yakan*, *शकन्* *śakan*, or as, in more remote analogy, the Greek, in the first person plural, has formed *μεν* from *μες* (*मस्* *mas*, “*mus*”) Besides this, M. Burnouf cites also the interrogative instrumental *काना* *kana*, “*with what?*” which is the only word that brings to my mind somewhat of conviction, and had struck my attention before, in passages like *यज्जाना यजाना यजाना* *kana yazna yazané*, “*with*

what offering shall I sacrifice? (V S p 481) I have not however ventured to draw a grammatical deduction from this form because the pronominal bases are prone to unite with one another and because I believed I might assume that the same pronoun which is contained in *अन ana* and *एन éna* forms also the last element of *अन्य lana* if from this base the instrumental only had been evolved or preserved as has also occurred in the Sanskrit *अन ana* and *एन éna* in but a few cases For the rest, the Greek *κεῖνος* also appears connected with this *अन्य lana* if it is looked upon as a theme with which the instrumental must agree in sound for *κεῖνος*, if not directly of interrogative meaning is still plainly connected with the old interrogative base (comp *कश्चन kashchana* who ever) Under these circumstances I cannot yet admit of any instrumentals in *a n a* especially as also the bases in *i* and *u* (in which the Sanskrit in the masculine and neuter likewise introduces a cuphonic *n*) in the Zend in words which we have noticed have dispensed with a similar insertion (§ 160) In another place (*Journal des Savans*) M Bournouf deduces the frequently occurring instrumental *अशयश्च अशयश्च* *ashayá* with purity from the masculine theme *अशय* *asha* and there would be accordingly *अशयश्च अशयश्च* *ashaya* in instrumental form at present standing alone in the Zend which I hesitate to acknowledge although it would be analogous to the Vedic form mentioned in § 159 *सुपनय सुपनय* *suapnayá* if one derives this with the Indian grammarians from a theme *सुपन सुपना* *suapna* But if instrumental forms of this kind in the Vedas or in the Zend are not to be produced in other undoubted instances as in the case of adjectives in construction with masculine or neuter substantives nothing prevents the assumption that the form *सुपनय सुपनय* *suapnayá* belongs to a feminine theme *सुपना सुपना* *suapná* especially as the suffix *न na* occurs also in other abstracts in the feminine form *ना ná* and therefore *सुपनय सुपनय* *suapnayá*



than ' who for the idea of man is lost in the general signification of the whole ) not by को ना *ko nā* but simply by को *ko* as follows को जनने पिता पुण्यस्य प्रथमं कं सयस्य तारकानाञ्च ददौ पदवीम् *ko jananeh pitā punyasya prathamam\** (किल सदव्यापापवड कश् चक्रे *kila sadvyapa* [G Ed p 301] *ratian kas chakre* 1 e *boni originem quis fecit?* ) *kah suryasya tārakanuncha dadāu padavim* (किल मागैन् तेय को ददौ *kila morgan tshan kō dadau* 1 e *viam ipsius quis dedit?* ) We translate from the Zend *Quis (qualis vir) creatione pater est puritatis (or puri) primus? quis (qualis vir) soli stellisque dedit viam?* The Zend expression *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 zanthuā* for which in the lithographed codex p 351 is erroneously given *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 zanthā* is plainly the instrumental of *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 zantu* which would correspond to the theme of a Sanskrit infinitive *जन्तुम् jantum* as the latter is feminine and to which I have in another place referred the ablative *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 zanthuat* (Gramm Crit p 253) This form is besides remarkable on this account viz that it is identical with the Sanskrit instrumental gerund which from *जन् jan* without a conjunctive vowel and without the euphonious suppression of the न *n* would sound *जन्वा jantuā* With regard however to the length of the concluding *a* of the Zend form which is preserved contrary to the prevailing rule (see §§ 118 158 and 160 p 191 G Ed where however *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 janthua* is to be read for *zanthua*) I do not attach any particular importance to that because in the chapter from which this passage is taken *a* originally short is repeatedly to be found lengthened The Sanskrit *जनेने jananeh* with which Neriosingh translates the Zend instrumental case must be considered as an ablative as this case often enters the department of the instrumental and is also capable of expressing

\* Perhaps the adverb *प्रथमं prathamam* *primum* is a corruption for *प्रथमं prathamam* *primus*, which answers to the original, and is to be expected from the sense

† Vide as to *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 zanthuā*, p 1244 G ed

the preposition "through" (for example, Nal. XII 89.) Considered as a genitive, *ਜਨਨੇ: jananêh* would not correspond with *ਸਭੰਗੁਤਿ zanthuâ*, which cannot possibly be a genitive, for the genitive of *ਜਨੰਤੁ zantu* could only be *ਸਭੰਗੁਤਿ zanteus*, or, also, *ਭੰਗੁਤਿ zanthuô*, or *ਭੰਗੁਤਿ zanturô* (see § 187.), but in no case *ਸਭੰਗੁਤਿ zanthuâ*. Add to this, also, that *ਜਨਨਿ janani* is feminine, like the Zend *ਜਨੰਤੁ zantu*, and *ਪੁੰਯਸ਼ੁ punyasya*, therefore, could no more pass as the epithet of *ਜਨਨੇ: jananêh* than, in Zend, *ਸ਼ਾਹਿਯਾ ashahyâ* could pass as the epithet of *ਸਭੰਗੁਤਿ zanthuâ*. I will, however, as concerns the Zend, lay no great stress on this circumstance, since in it the genders of the substantive are constantly changing. M. Burnouf, who looks upon *ਜਨਨੇ: jananêh* as a genitive, and refers *ਪੁੰਯਸ਼ੁ punyasya* to it, according to this interpretation justly takes objection to the *ਪੁੰਯਸ਼ੁ punyasya*, which does not agree with the gender of *ਜਨਨਿ janani*, but he confirms, however, the reading expressly by the addition of a

[G. Ed p 302] *sic*. His translation runs, "*Quel est le premier père de la creation pure? qui a montré leur route au soleil et aux astres*" I look with anxiety for M. Burnouf's further explanation of this passage, but expect from him rather information of value in other respects, than to find that he has succeeded in making the forms *ਜਨਨੇ: jananêh* and *ਸਭੰਗੁਤਿ zanthuâ* pass for genitives. Anquetil's traditional interpretation sounds, in this place, very strange, but does not contradict my apprehension of *ਸਭੰਗੁਤਿ zanthuâ* he makes the genitive *ਸ਼ਾਹਿਯਾ ashahyâ* pass for the nominative, and does not, therefore, throw any light on the meaning of the termination *ਸ਼ਾਹਿਯਾ hyâ*, for, in the presumption that it was right, *ਸ਼ਾਹਿਯਾ ashahyâ* might, perhaps, have next been taken for an instrumental, and perhaps have been translated "father with purity" His translation is as follows "*Quel est le premier père pur? qui a engendré? qui a donné*

\* In other places (V S p 385) Anquetil renders (p 137) the words  
ਸ਼ਾਹਿਯਾ

*de lui même les astres qui ne sont pas à deux faces?* The sun is here quite left out of the question and it must be acknowledged that as far as relates to etymology it is very much obscured in this passage we might identify with reference to the form of *လှေငှာ* *kheng* this expression with the reflexive pronoun *ယု* *kha* (as in *kha dāta* created of it self which is often and of the star, as of self created lights) and consider it as the epithet of *ယုလှေငှာ* *stren cha* so that it would correspond as accusative plural to the Sanskrit *सूदन* *sūdan*. It is here to be remarked that in some chapters of the Jzeshine *လှေ* *ng* is repeatedly found instead of a simple nasal and indeed without regard to the origin of the following initial letter. So we read in the V S p 391 *လှေငှာ* *dushacsathreng*\* *လှေငှာ* *dusshyañlineng* *လှေငှာ* *dushdañeng*. Anquetil indeed renders these expressions as singular nominatives *ce roi mechant, qui fait le mal attaché à la mauvaise loi* but they together with [G Ed p 203] *လှေငှာ* *dushachanhō* *လှေငှာ* *dushmananhō* refer to the plural *လှေငှာ* *dregalō* and I have no doubt of their accusative nature the whole passage however like many others in the Jzeshine can be explained only with the help of Neriossingh's Sanskrit translation. We can but regret that the in other respects highly valuable elaborate exactitude of Burnouf's excellent Commentary leaves us no hope that he will come very soon to the elucidation of this and other passages regarding which I am most curious. But to return to our *လှေငှာ* *kheng*

*ယုလှေငှာ* *patā asāhyā* rightly by *père de la pureté* his translation is however little calculated to throw light on the connection of the passage referred to

\* The lithographic MS has *လှေငှာ* *du. a csathreng* as two words the *a* is however clearly only a conjunctive vowel, to unite the prefix *လှေ* *dush* more conveniently with the following *ယု* *cs*

the *kh* makes no difficulty in this expression, even in its acceptation for the sun, for which, commonly, *ḥvarē* is found (the Sanskrit *सुख suar*, "heaven,"), as *kh* is used very frequently for *hv* (see § 35), but we might here expect to find *ḥharē*, and may suppose that the *ng* has arisen out of *n*, and this letter out of *r*, as these liquids are easily interchanged, as is shewn in Sanskrit, by the connection of *अह्ना ahan*, "day," with *अहार ahar*, and, in the Zend, that of *csapan*, "night," with *csapar* (I write it thus, and not *ḥcsapan*, designedly, see § 44) At all events I take *kheng* to be the accusative, if, indeed, it may not also be conjectured that the base *ḥvar* may have entirely lost its *r*, and that it may be *kheng* for *khem*, the accusative of a base *lha* *stien-cha*, also, according to my opinion, is the accusative, and not, as one might expect from the Sanskrit translation, the genitive plural, which more frequently occurs in the form *stūranm* Although, from this, *stren* might easily be formed by contraction and combination with *cha*, I nevertheless prefer acknowledging in *stiencha*, a secondary form of *streus*, explained in § 239, so that the nasal, here vocalized to *u*, is there retained, but the sibilant has been removed (comp § 239), especially as, in other places also, *dā* is found in construction with the accusative of the person, which has been given In the Zend expression, *adhvānēm*, the Sanskrit *अध्वानम् adhvānam* cannot fail to be observed (comp § 45), but in the lithographed MS we have instead of this, *advānēm*, which is easily seen to be an error This false reading appears, nevertheless, to be an ancient one, and widely diffused, and upon this is founded Anquetil's, or rather his Pâsî teacher's, interpretation, which is strangely at variance with Neriosinghi's exposition, "*qui* [G Ed. p 304.] *ne sont pas a deux faces*," so that *a* is

taken for the well known privative particle *अन्* *dia* as the number two and the last portion finds in the Sanskrit *अनना* 'countenance' its corresponding syllable

#### FEMININE BASES IN *d* GOTHIC *ð* (§ 118)

Nominative	Sanskrit <i>dhará</i> * Greek <i>χώρα</i> , Lithuanian <i>ranka</i> Zend <i>hizta</i> Gathic <i>giba</i> Latin <i>terra</i>
Accusative	Sansk. <i>dhará m</i> Latin <i>terram</i> Zend <i>hizta nm</i> Greek <i>χώρα ν</i> Lith. <i>ranka n</i> Gath. <i>giba</i>
Instrumental	Sanskrit <i>dharay d</i> Zend <i>hi-ray-a</i> Gathic Dī Instr. <i>gihaz</i> (§ 161) Lithuanian <i>ranka</i>
Dative	Sansk. <i>dharáy-dī</i> Zend <i>hi-ray-dī</i> Lith. <i>ranka i</i>
Ablative	Zend <i>hi-ray át</i> Latin <i>terra(d)</i>
Genitive	Sanskrit <i>dharáy-ds</i> Zend <i>hi-ray do</i> Greek <i>χώρας</i> Latin <i>terrā s</i> Lithuanian <i>rankos</i> Gothic <i>gibō s</i>
Locative	Sanskrit <i>dharay-am</i> (§ 202) Zend <i>hizray-a</i> Lithuanian <i>ranko ye</i> (§ 19)
Vocative	Sanskrit <i>dhará</i> Zend <i>hizē</i> (?) Greek <i>χώρα</i> , Latin <i>terra</i> Lithuanian <i>ranka</i> Gothic <i>giba</i> (?)

#### DUAL

Nom Acc Voc	Sanskrit <i>dharé</i> Zend <i>hi ið</i> (§ 213) Lithuanian Nomin <i>ranki</i> Voc <i>ránki</i>
Instr Dī Abl	Sanskrit <i>dhará bhyām</i> Zend <i>hizi i bya</i> † Greek Dī Gen <i>χώρα ν</i> Lith. Dī <i>ranko-m</i> (§ 215)
Gen Loc	Sanskrit <i>dharay ds</i> [G Ed p 300]

\* Means 'earth' and is probably connected with the Greek *χώρα* as aspirates are easily interchanged (Buttmann § 16 Rem 1) The root is *√ dhri* (√ *dhri* § 1) to hold carry whence also *√ dhri* which by reason of the long vowel of its root, approaches nearer the Greek *χώρα* (§ 4) altho it does not signify earth.

† Without being able to quote this case in Zend bases in *d* I still have no doubt of the genuineness of the above form since I can prove by other cognate case terminations 1 That the *d* is not shortened and 2 also that an *i* is not introduced into the theme by the assimilative power of the termination hence *e g* in the instr pl *अप्यङ्गुलिषु* *gindābis* (V S p 308) from *अप्यङ्गुलि* *gendā* 'woman' (गुण)



FEMININE BASES IN 1.<sup>7</sup>

## SINGULAR

Nominative,	Sanskrit <i>prīti-s</i> , Zend <i>āfrīti-s</i> , Greek <i>πόρι-ς</i> , Latin <i>turri-s</i> , Lithuanian <i>auri-s</i> , Gothic <i>anst'-s</i>
Accusative,	Sanskrit <i>prīti-m</i> , Latin <i>turri-m</i> , Zend <i>āfrīti-m</i> , Greek <i>πόρι-ν</i> , Lithuanian <i>auri-n</i> , Gothic <i>anst'</i> .
Instrumental,	Sanskrit <i>prīty-ā</i> , Zend <i>āfrīthy-a</i> , Gothic Dat Instr. <i>anstai</i> (without case suffix, see §. 161)
Dative,	Sanskrit <i>prītay-ē</i> (or <i>prīty-āi</i> , §. 161), Zend <i>āfrīte-ē</i> †
Ablative,	Zend <i>āfrītōi-t</i> , Latin <i>turri-(d)</i>
Genitive,	Sanskrit <i>prītē-s</i> (or only with the feminine termination <i>prīty-ās</i> ), Gothic <i>anstai-s</i> , Zend <i>āfrītōi-s</i> , Greek <i>πόρι-ος, φύσ-ως</i> , Lat <i>turri-s</i>
Locative,	Sanskrit <i>prīt-āu</i> , (or with the feminine termination only <i>prīty-ām</i> )
Vocative,	Sanskrit <i>prītē</i> , Zend <i>āfrīti</i> , Greek <i>πόρι</i>

## DUAL

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit *prīti*, Zend *āfrīti(?)*, Lithuanian Nom [G Ed. p 306] *auri*, Voc *auri*.

\* It may be sufficient to give here the cases of a Sanskrit masculine in इ, which differ from the feminine paradigma from *agni*, "fire," comes the instrumental singular *agni-n-ā*—whilst from *pati*, "master," comes *paty-a*, and from *sakhī*, "friend," *sakhī-ā* (see § 158)—and in the accus plural अग्नीन् *agnī-n*

† Differing from what is stated in § 164 p 196 G Ed, it is now my opinion that the *ē* in *āfrīte* does not represent the *a* of the original form *āfrītayē*, but is the contraction of *a* and *y*, as, for instance, in the Pīakūt चिन्तेमि *chintēmi*, from चिन्तयामि *chintayāmi* *ē* is here a weaker form of *é=ए*, and is more properly used to represent the latter than another vowel. With regard to the Lithuanian, see p 218, Note †

Instr Dat Abl Sanskrit *priti-bhyām* Zend *āfriti bya* Greek  
Gen Dat *πορι ο ιν* Lithuanian Dat *auri m*  
(§ 215)

Gen Loc Sanskrit *prity us* Zend *āfrithy ō (?)* (see p 276  
Rem 1)

## PLURAL

Nom Voc Sanskrit *pritay as* Zend *āfrithy ō* (with *cha*  
and *āfrithy as cha*) Greek *πορι ες* Latin  
*turr es*\* Gothic *anslei s* Lithuanian *ūny s*

Accusative Sanskrit *priti s* Zend *āfriti s* Greek *πορι ς*  
Gothic *anslei ns* Lithuanian *auri s*

Instrumental Sanskrit *priti bhis* Zend *āfriti bis* Lithuanian  
*auri mis* Gothic Dat Instr *anslei m* (§ 215)

Dat Abl Sanskrit *priti bhyas* Zend *āfriti byo* Latin *tur  
ri bus* Lithuanian *auri m(u)s* (§ 215)

Genitive Sanskrit *priti n ām* Zend *āfriti n anm* Latin  
*turri um* Greek *πορι ωι* Lithuanian *auri u*  
Gothic *anslei ē*

Locative Sanskrit *priti shu* Zend *āfriti shva* (or *āfriti  
shu*) Lithuanian *auri sa* Greek Dat *πορι σι*

## INFLECTED BASES IN 1

## SINGULAR

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit *vāri* Zend *vairi* Greek *ῥορι* Latin  
*mare*

The rest like the masculine

## DUAL

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit *vāri n i*

The rest like the masculine

## PLURAL

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit *vāri n i* Zend [G Ed p 307]  
*vār a* Greek *ῥορι α* Latin *maria* Gothic  
*thry a* (from *THRI* three)

The rest like the masculine

\* Vide p 1078 G ed as to *turrē s* and similar forms



MASCULINE BASES IN *u*

## SINGULAR

Nominative,	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-s</i> , Gothic <i>sunu-s</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunù-s</i> , Zend <i>paśu-s</i> , Latin <i>pecu-s</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ-s</i> .
Accusative,	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-m</i> , Latin <i>pecu-m</i> , Zend <i>paśù-m</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ-v</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunu-n</i> , Gothic <i>sunu</i>
Instrumental,	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-n-ā</i> ( <i>Vêda prabāhar-ā</i> , from <i>prabāhu</i> , §. 158.), Zend <i>paśi-u</i> , Gothic Dat. Instr. <i>sunau</i>
Dative,	Sanskrit <i>sūnar-ā</i> , Zend <i>paśi-ē</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunu-i</i>
Ablative,	Zend <i>paśad-t</i> , Latin <i>pecu-(d)</i>
Genitive,	Sanskrit <i>sūnô-s</i> (from <i>sunau-s</i> ), Gothic <i>sunau-s</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunau-s</i> , Zend <i>paśeu-s</i> or <i>paśv-ô</i> (from <i>paśi-aś</i> ), Latin <i>pecû-s</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ-os</i> .
Locative,	Sanskrit <i>sūn'-āu</i> .
Vocative	Sanskrit <i>sūnô</i> (from <i>sunau</i> ), Gothic <i>sunau</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunau</i> , Zend <i>paśu</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ</i> .

## DUAL

Nom Acc Voc	Sanskrit <i>sūnâ</i> , Zend <i>paśû</i> , Lithuanian Nom. <i>sunù</i> , Voc. <i>sūnu</i> .
Instr. Dat. Abl	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-bhryâm</i> , Zend <i>paśu-biya</i> , Greek <i>βοτρυ-ο-iv</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunu-m</i> (§. 215)
Gen Loc.	Sanskrit <i>sūn-ô-s</i> , Zend <i>paśv-ô</i> (see p. 276. [G Ed p 308] Rem 1)

## PLURAL

Nom Voc.	Sanskrit <i>sūnav-as</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ-ες</i> , Zend <i>paśi-ô</i> (with <i>cha</i> , <i>paśvas-cha</i> ), Latin <i>pecû-s</i> , Gothic <i>sunyu-s</i> (for <i>suniu-s</i> , from <i>sunau-s</i> , § 230.), Lithuanian <i>sūnu-s</i>
Instrumental,	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-bhis</i> , Zend <i>paśu-bîs</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunu-mis</i> , Gothic Dat. Instr. <i>sunu-m</i> (§ 215).

Genitive	Sanskrit <i>sunu n ām</i> Zend <i>pasu-anm</i> Latin <i>pecu um</i> Greek <i>βοτρυ-ων</i> Gothic <i>sunu ē</i> Lithuanian <i>sun u</i>
Locative	Sanskrit <i>sunu shu</i> Zend <i>pasu shu</i> (or <i>pasu shu</i> ) Lithuanian <i>sunu se</i> Greek Ditt <i>βοτρυ σι</i>

Remark—Feminine bases in *u* in Sanskrit differ in declension from the masculine exactly as p 303 G Fd प्राति प्रति f differs from अग्नि agni m

NEUTER BASES IN *u*

## SINGULAR

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit	<i>madhu</i>	Zend	<i>mailhu</i>	Greek	<i>μεθυ</i>
Latin	<i>pecu</i>	Gothic	<i>farhu</i>		
The rest like the masculine					

## DUAL

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit	<i>madhu n i</i>		
The rest like the masculine			

## PLURAL

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit	<i>madhū n i</i>	Zend	<i>madhu-a</i>	Greek	<i>μεθυ α</i>
Latin	<i>pecu a</i>				
The rest like the masculine					

FEMININE BASES IN *i* [G Fd p 300]

## SINGULAR

	Sanskrit		Zend
Nom	<i>nāri</i> woman	<i>bhi s</i> scur	<i>nāri</i> woman
Accus	<i>nāri m</i>	<i>bhiy am</i>	<i>nāri m</i>
Insti	<i>nāry ā</i>	<i>bhiy-ā</i>	<i>nāry a</i>
Dit	<i>nāry-āi</i>	<i>bhiy ē</i> or <i>bhiy-āi</i>	<i>nāry āi</i>
Abl	<i>nāry ās</i>	<i>bhiy as</i> or <i>bhiy ās</i>	<i>nāry āt</i>
Gen	<i>nāry ās</i>	<i>bhiy as</i> or <i>bhiy ās</i>	<i>nāry-āo</i>
Loc	<i>nāry-ām</i>	<i>bhiy i</i> or <i>bhiy-ām</i>	<i>nāry a</i>
Voc	<i>nāri</i>	<i>bhi s</i>	<i>nāri</i>

		DUAT	Zend
		<i>Sanskrit</i>	
N A V.	<i>nâry-âu,</i>	<i>bhîy-âu,</i>	<i>nâiri</i> (see § 213, p 227 )
I. D Ab	<i>nâri-bhyâm,</i>	<i>bhî-bhyâm,</i>	<i>nâiri-bya.</i>
Loc	<i>nâry-ôs,</i>	<i>bhîy-ôs,</i>	<i>nâiry-ô?</i>
		PIURAT	
N. V.	<i>nâry-âs,</i>	<i>bhîy-as,</i>	<i>nâiry-âo</i>
Accus	<i>nâri-s,</i>	<i>bhîy-as,</i>	<i>nâiri-s</i>
Instr.	<i>nâri-bhis,</i>	<i>bhî-bhis,</i>	<i>nâiri-bîs</i>
D. Abl	<i>nâri-bhyas,</i>	<i>bhî-bhyas,</i>	<i>nâiri-byâ</i>
Gen	<i>nâri-n-âm,</i>	<i>bhîy-âm,</i>	<i>nâiri-n-anm.</i>
Loc.	<i>nâri-shu,</i>	<i>bhî-shu,</i>	<i>nâiri-shva</i> or <i>-shu.</i>

“Remark By the side of the declension of monosyllabic feminine bases in *i*, which may reject the terminations peculiar to the feminine alone, may be placed the Greek

[G Ed p 310] *κίς*, and a remarkable similarity of inflexion will be observed, as Nom *bhî-s*, *κίς*, Gen. *bhîy-as*, *κί-ός*, Loc Dat. *bhîy-i*, *κί-ί*, Acc. *stri-m*, † *κί-v*, Voc. *bhî-s*, *κίς*. Plural Nom. *bhîy-as*, *κί-ες*, Gen. *bhîy-âm* *κί-ων*, Loc. Dat. *bhî-shu*, *κί-σί*, Acc *bhîy-as*, *κί-ας*, Voc. *bhîy-as*, *κί-ες*. I consider, however, this coincidence as accidental, but, nevertheless, an accidental coincidence of that nature, that can only occur in languages which were originally really one and undoubtedly the terminations, whose common sound appears so startling, are historically connected. As far, however, as concerns the theme, I believe, with Kuhner (§ 287), that the *i* of *κί* was not the original concluding radical letter of the word, but that a consonant has fallen out after the *i*. I would rather, however, leave the question as to this consonant undecided, than assume

\* O1 *bhî-n-âm* Further, the longer case-terminations, which belong to the feminine (see § 164), are added at will to the monosyllabic feminines in *i*, *û*, for example, together with *bhîyê*, *bhîurê*, also *bhîyâi*, *bhîurvâi*

† Or, like the other monosyllabic words in *i*, with the termination *am*, *striy-am*

that  $\kappa\iota\phi$  is the true theme and that the nominative was originally  $\kappa\iota\phi\varsigma$ , for if  $\kappa\iota\phi\varsigma$   $\kappa\iota$  in the form in which they have been received be analogous to  $\Delta\iota\phi\varsigma$   $\Delta\iota$ , from  $\Delta\iota\phi\phi\varsigma$   $\Delta\iota\phi$  still to establish a theme  $\kappa\iota\phi$  a proof must be brought similar to that which really attaches to  $\Delta\iota\phi$  from its being found in inscriptions. And besides this that which of itself is alone sufficient proof the cognate Sanskrit word दिव् *div*

heaven (§ 122) likewise attests a digamma. All ground for supposing a theme  $\kappa\iota\phi$  is however wanting for the long  $\iota$  could as in the Sanskrit भि *bhi* and like the long  $\upsilon$  in  $\phi\phi\upsilon\varsigma$  be also the real final letter of the base only that the long  $\iota$  in the Sanskrit except in compounds (for example गता *gata* *bhi* in *f* void of fear मलयी *m f* water drinking see Gramm Crit §§ 169 170) concludes only the feminine theme.

We will therefore seek elucidation regarding the Greek  $\kappa\iota\varsigma$  in another way through the Sanskrit and we find this as it appears to me through a like masculine base which approximates closely to the  $\kappa\iota\varsigma$  as well in form as in meaning namely in कृि *kṛi* Nom कृि *kṛi* *s* insect worm which would lead us to expect in the Greek  $\kappa\iota\phi\varsigma$  Acc  $\kappa\iota\phi\iota$  to which  $\kappa\iota\varsigma$   $\kappa\iota\upsilon$  bear the same relation as  $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\varsigma$   $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu$  to the to be presupposed  $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\phi\varsigma$ ,  $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\phi\iota$ . I do not consider it requisite to assume a theme  $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\tau$  although the Sanskrit महत् *mahat* great might support it but महत् *mahat* is a participial form and its full and original form [G Ed p 311] (§ 129) is महन् *mahant* Nom masc महन् *mahān* which would correspond to the Greek  $\mu\epsilon\gamma\omega\nu$ .

FEMININE BASES IN  $\acute{\alpha}$   $\ddot{u}$ 

## SINGULAR

	Sanskrit		Greek
Nom	$\iota\alpha\delta\eta\acute{\alpha}$ <i>s</i> wife	$b\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}$ <i>s</i> eye brow	$\phi\phi\rho\iota$ <i>s</i>
Accus	$\iota\alpha\delta\eta\acute{\alpha}$ <i>m</i>	$b\eta\rho\upsilon\nu$ <i>am</i> ,	$\phi\phi\rho\upsilon$ <i>i</i>
Instr	$\iota\alpha\delta\eta\upsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}$	$b\eta\rho\upsilon\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}$	
Dat	$\iota\alpha\delta\eta\upsilon$ - $\acute{\alpha}$ <i>i</i>	$b\eta\rho\upsilon\upsilon$ - <i>e</i> (or $\acute{\alpha}$ <i>i</i> )	

SINGULAR,			
	Sanskrit	Greek	
Abl.	<i>vadhu-ās,</i>	<i>bhruv-as</i> (oi -ās),	• • •
Gen.	<i>vadhu-ās,</i>	<i>bhruv-as</i> (oi -ās),	ὀφρύ-ος
Loc.	<i>vadhu-ām,</i>	<i>bhruv-i</i> (oi -ām),	ὀφρύ-ι
Voc	<i>vadhu,</i>	<i>bhrū-s,</i>	ὀφρῦ̄.
DUAL			
N.Ac V	<i>vādhu-āu,</i>	<i>bhrū-āu,</i>	ὀφρύ-ς
I D Ab.	<i>vadhū-bhyām</i>	<i>bhrū-bhyām.</i>	ὀφρύ-ο-ιν.
G L.	<i>vadhū-ōs,</i>	<i>bhrū-ōs,</i>	• •
PLURAL			
N. V	<i>vadhu-as,</i>	<i>bhrū-as,</i>	ὀφρύ-ες
Accns.	<i>vadhū-s,</i>	<i>bhrū-as,</i>	ὀφρύ-ας
Instr.	<i>vadhū-bhis,</i>	<i>bhrū-bhis,</i>	
D. Abl	<i>vadhū-bhyas,</i>	<i>bhrū-bhyas,</i>	
Gen.	<i>vadhū-n-ām,</i>	<i>bhrū-ām</i> (or <i>bhrū-n-ām</i> ),	ὀφρύ-ων.
Loc	<i>vadhū-shu,</i>	<i>bhrū-shu,</i>	ὀφρύ-σι

Remark The identity of  $\text{भ्रू}$  *bhrū* and 'ΟΦΡΥ\* is [G Ed p 312] sufficient proof that the length of the *u* is organic (comp. §. 121), and it is not necessary, therefore, to suppose a theme ΟΦΡΥF (comp. Kühner §. 289) so as to consider ὀφρύς as coming from ὀφρυFs, and the long *u* as a compensation for the rejected *F*, as perhaps μέλας from μέλας. That, however, *F* originally stood for example, ὀφρύFος—before the terminations now commencing with a vowel, though at a time when the language had not a Grecian form is shewn by the Sanskrit *bhruv-as*, by which, at the same time, the shortening of the *u* in this case is justified, for the Sanskrit

\* The *o* in ὀφρύς is based on the peculiar disposition of the Greek to prefix a vowel to words which originally commenced with a consonant, to which I have already drawn attention in another place, and by which, among other things, the relation of ὄνυξ, ὄνομα, to नखस् *nakhā-s*, नाम *nāma*, is shewn.

changes that is to say in polysyllables as well *u* as *û* before vowel terminations into a simple *u* but in monosyllables in order to avoid commencing with two consonants or to gain a polysyllabic form the semi vowel has its corresponding short vowel placed before it and thus is formed  $\text{उव}$  *uv* (*uv*) as well from *u* as from *û* is under a similar condition  $\text{इ}$  from *i* and *î* hence the two opposite forms for example *radhw a* (not *radhuw-as*) women and *bhruv-as* (not *bhrîw-as*) the eyebrows as above *bhîy as* (not *bhîy as*) opposed to *nâry-as* (*nâriy as*) In the dative plural the short *u* of  $\text{उषुः}$  *ci* for  $\text{उषुः}$  *ci* may be attributed to the effeminate habit of regularly shortening the *u* before vowel terminations

BASES IN *au* (अँ) \*

	SINGULAR	
	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Greek</i>
Nominative	<i>nâu s</i>	$\nu\hat{a}\hat{u} \varsigma$
Accusative	<i>nai am</i>	$\nu\hat{a}\hat{u} \iota$
Genitive	<i>nai as</i>	$\iota\alpha(F)\omicron\varsigma$
Locative	<i>nai i</i>	$\iota\alpha(F) \iota$
Vocative	<i>nâu s</i>	$\iota\hat{a}\hat{u} \varsigma$
	[G Ed p. 313]	
	PLURAL	
Nom Acc Voc	<i>nai au</i>	$\iota\alpha(F) \epsilon$
Instr Dat Abl	<i>nâu bhyâm</i>	$\iota\alpha(F) \omicron \iota \iota$
	PLURAL	
Nominative	<i>nai-as</i>	$\iota\hat{a}(F) \epsilon\varsigma$
Accusative	<i>nâi as</i>	$\iota\hat{a}(F) \alpha\varsigma$
Genitive	<i>nâi am</i>	$\nu\alpha(F)\hat{\omega}\iota$
Locative	<i>nâu shu</i>	Dat $\iota\alpha\nu \sigma\iota$
Vocative	<i>nâi-as</i>	$\iota\alpha(F) \epsilon\varsigma$

Remark.—I find no sufficient grounds with Kulner (l c § 297) to suppose that the base of the nominatives

\* I give only the cases retained in the Greek



in *av*s, *ev*s, *ov*s, originally terminated in *F*, so that in the case before us it would be requisite to suppose a theme *NAF* for even if the vocalization of *F* to *v*, in order to facilitate the junction with a consonant following, did not surprise us (forms like *vaF*s, *vaF*si, could never occur),—still, on the other hand, the transition of the sound *v* into its corresponding semi-vowel, in order to avoid the hiatus, is far more regular, and is required in the Sanskrit according to the common rules of euphony. We will not therefore differ from the Indian grammarians, by the assumption of a theme नाव् *nāv* for नौ *nāu*, and गव् *gav* for गो *gô* (*bos*), although, if there were adequate reasons for it, the practice of the Indian grammarians would not restrain us from laying down गव् *gav* and नाव् *nāv* in the Sanskrit as the true themes, which maintained themselves in this form only before vowel terminations, but before consonants have allowed the *v* to pass into a *u*, according to the analogy of the anomalous दिव् *div*, “heaven”, whence, for example, the instrumental plural द्युभिस् *dyu-bhis* for दिव्भिस् *div-bhis*, which would be phonetically impossible (Gramm. Crit. § 208). The Latin *navis* cannot compel us to lay down a theme *nāv* for the Sanskrit and Greek, for the Latin base has extended itself by an unorganic *i*, as *śuan*, “dog,” lengthened to *cani*; and therefore it exhibits in its declension nowhere *u*, but universally *v*.

[G Ed. p 314] BASES TERMINATING WITH A CONSONANT.

	SINGULAR			
	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek.</i>
Thema,	<i>VĀCH,</i>	<i>VĀCH,</i>	<i>VŌC,</i>	ὈΠ
Nom.	<i>vāk,</i>	<i>vāc-s,</i>	<i>voc-s,</i>	ὄπ-ς.
Accus	<i>vāch-am,</i>	<i>vāch-ēm</i>	<i>voc-em,</i>	ὄπ-α.
Instr	<i>vāch-ā,</i>	<i>vāch-a,</i>	.	..
Dative,	<i>vāch-ē,</i>	<i>vāch-ē.</i>	.	.. *

\* See Locative

SINGULAR				
	Sanskrit	Zend	Latin	Greek
Ablat	*	<i>īch-at</i>	<i>īoc-e(d)</i>	
Gen	<i>īch as</i>	<i>īch ō †</i>	<i>voc-is</i>	<i>οπ-ος</i>
Loc	<i>īch i</i>	<i>īch i</i>	D <i>īoc i</i>	D <i>οπ i</i>
Voc	<i>īdī</i>	<i>īlc-s ?</i>	<i>īoc s</i>	<i>ὀπ s</i>
DUAL				
N Acc V	<i>īch āu</i>	<i>īach-āo</i>		
or	<i>īch ā †</i>	<i>īch a</i>		<i>ὀπ c</i>
I D Abl	<i>īdg bhyum</i>			D G <i>οπ ο-ῖ</i>
G L	<i>īch-ōs</i>	<i>īch ō ?</i>		
PLURAL				
N V	<i>īch as</i>	<i>īch ō †</i>	<i>īoc es</i>	<i>ὀπ es</i>
Accus	<i>īch-as</i>	<i>īch o †</i>	<i>voc-es</i>	<i>ὀπ as</i>
Instr	<i>īdg bhis</i>			
D Abl	<i>īdg bhyas</i>		<i>īoc i bus</i>	
Gen	<i>īch ām</i>	<i>īch-anm</i>	<i>īoc um</i>	
I oc	<i>īlk-shu</i>	<i>īlc shīa ?</i>		D <i>οπ σi</i>

<sup>1</sup> Remark 1.—I leave the terminations in [G Ed p 315] the Zend which commence with *b* unnoticed, since contrary to my former opinion (§ 224 Note \*) I look on the *ξ e* in forms like *μαξξρβας*? *raochebis* no longer as a conjunctive vowel and therefore no longer attribute the said form to a theme *ρβας*? *raoc*: but assume that *μαξξρβας*? *raochebis* and similar forms have proceeded from bases in *βθ* (from os § 56<sup>b</sup>) so that I look upon the *ξ e* as a corruption of the *θ* and to the form *μαξξρβας*? *raochebyθ* I place as anterior a lost form *μαξξρβας*? *raochθ byθ* § In a similar way

\* Like the Genitive

† With *cha* and *īachas-cha*

‡ See p 330 Note \*

§ M Burnouf who has induced me by his excellent pamphlet cited at p 276 on the Valista (in the separate impression p 16 and following) to rectify my former views leaves p 18 note the question still undecided whether forms like *μαξξξας* *maχebis* *μαξξας* *manebis* *μαξξας*

[G Ed. p 316] I find, in the *Piñhit* (*Urvasi*, by Lenz, p. 40.), *अचरिहं achharēhun* for *अचरिहं achharōhun* (Sanskrit *apsarōbbhus*), and if this form is genuine, then the  $\xi e$ , in forms like *աչբիս raochebīs*, appears to stand for  $\nu \acute{e}$ , as generally many interchanges between  $\xi e$  and  $\nu \acute{e}$  occur, although in the case before us the  $\xi e$  is very constantly written, and  $\nu \acute{e}$  has not yet been pointed out in its place. If it is further considered that we often find *չի ye* for *ի յո*, “which,” *չի ke* for *ի յո kó*, “who?” and in the pronoun of the 2d person in the plural also *չի ve* for *ի յո vó*, and, finally, in the pronoun of the 1st person *չի ne* for *ի յո nó*, then we see the change of the *ի ó* with  $\xi e$  is sufficiently ascertained, although it appears to be restricted to the end of words of a monosyllabic form, and in these the practice of writing the *ի ó* is the prevailing one, while before termi-

*աչբիս vachebīs*, *աչբիս raochebīs*, have so arisen from the bases *ի մազ mazó*, &c, that the *ի ó* (*ազ az*) is suppressed, and  $\xi e$  then introduced as conjunctive vowel, or whether, before the *ó* (from *ai*) only, the *z* has been rejected, and the preceding *a* with an epenthetic *i* united with an *e*. In the former case I should not have been entirely wrong, from the analogy of *raoch-e-bīs*, to deduce forms like *vách-e-bīs*. I consider, however, the last view as the right one, only that I prefer letting the *ó* from the pre-supposed original form, *manó-bīs*, *raochó bīs*, be changed in its whole force into  $\xi e$ , rather than reduce it into its elements, and mix the first of the said elements (*a*) with a conjoined *i* for the derivation of *manebīs* from *manabīs* from *manabīs*, for *manashīs*, would extend to the Sanskrit form *मनोभिः manóbbhis*, which originally may have been *manarbbhis* (*manas-bhis* was never possible). But I believe that in the Zend the form *ebīs* really preceded the form *óbīs*. M. Burnouf, in his review in the *Journal des Savans* (in the separate impression, pp 30, 31), calls attention to a form *վաղչեհիյո vāghčēhībīyó*, for which is once found, in the Vend Sâde, pp 69 and 70, *վաղչեհիյո vāghčēhībīyó* once *վաղչեհիյո vāghčēhībīyó*, and once *վաղչեհիյո vāghčēhībīyó*, which,

nations beginning with *b* as yet no *u* has been pointed out so that *b* appears to be as repugnant to *n* preceding *u* as favourable to *u* following, *u* if the conjecture of Burnouf mentioned at p 29<sup>n</sup> G Ed is well founded. On this point I was not yet clearly informed when nt §§ 221 and 212 I inconsiderately imagined I could deduce *tachā bya tachā-bis* from *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* (from *tacha*). Instead of this should be read *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tachā bya 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tachā-bis* and besides this in the locative singular *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tachāhi* for *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tachānti* since the nasal to be prefixed to the *h* according to § 26<sup>i</sup> falls away when the vowel which follows the *h* is *i* which has been already indicated in the paragraph quoted but since then fully proved by Bur- [G Ed p 317] nouf. Besides there really occurs also in one passage (where unfortunately the lithographed MS is faulty and is therefore

which with the conjunctive vowel *ē* (see 4 30) introduced in different ways plainly represent one and the same word and have proceeded from *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀* which itself never occurs. Although these forms which had struck me likewise clearly I long to a theme which means *di course* and is connected with our *recl* I would still rather not, with Burnouf derive it from *tach* so that the nominative of this *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀* *ides* raised to a secondary theme would be contained therein. We dare not without further authority attribute to the Zend such a misformation although it leaves its superlatives in *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tuma* from the masculine nominative instead of from the theme. But Anquetil, in his Glossary gives a form *tachāngl* <sup>1</sup>, "*paro e utile*" which we ought probably to read *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tachānt* (as dative) if not with long *a* *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tachāntē*. This latter form would belong to a theme *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 ta u* (*idesas*) from which in the dative pl., *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀* (*igle hly* <sup>1</sup> &c) might proceed for *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tachānt* as with *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 ma ebis* *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 manē* occur also *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 ma bis* *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 man* <sup>1</sup> for the *as* of *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 tachānt* must as Burnouf has shown in contact with *h* become *eb* <sup>1</sup>.

impossible for me to use) the locative *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀* *vachahi*, that is to say, in the Vend S p 173, where, for *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬢𐬀* *manahēchā vachahēchā*, is to be read *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬢𐬀* *manahichā vachahichā*. In a Grammar, the lost acquaintance with which is again to be restored, oversights of this kind will, I trust, be excused in the first labourers; and if, for example, Rask gives to the word *partī* the genitive *partōis*, while, according to §. 180. p 196, Note †, *patōis* is to be written, still the form *partōis* was, in its time, instructive in the main, and first taught me that the Sanskrit genitive termination *-s* corresponds to the form *ōis* in the Zend. If, too, Rask has incorporated in his scheme of declensions the ablative *partūt* (for *patūt*), this was indeed a new error, but also a new advantage for the Zend Grammar in its then state, and brought to light a new and important fact, which I believe I was the first to discover, namely this, that bases in *z* form their ablative in *ūt*, for which the proofs in the Zend-Avesta, as much as I have of it, are neither numerous nor easily found. I make this remark because M Burnouf, as it appears to me, speaks too unfavourably of such theoretic formations. As far as I am concerned, I believe I may assert that my communications regarding Zēnd Grammar are founded on careful reflection. I could not, however, perfectly conclude my considerations, and I am very ready to complete and adjust them through those of M. Burnouf. For in this book also, in regard to Zend Grammar, one must carefully distinguish the disquisitions given in the text from the general comparison added at the end of each rule regarding case. In the former I give only those Zend forms which I have seen, and I thence deduce theoretic laws. In the latter I seek to make the deductions from the inquiries pursued in the text evident in one select example. I am perfectly sure of the prevailing majority of the forms given in the tables, and can produce abundant examples

of them. I have marked some as questionable and shewn the limits of the probability of others in notes and if an error has crept into the forms spoken of and by me believed to be correct it will give me pleasure to be able hereafter supplementarily to correct it. The form *αρχαῖα* was however only in a measure a theoretic formation and I should not have ventured to [G Ed p 318] exhibit it if I had not observed in other words of the same declension *ι ε* in other bases terminating with a consonant, the locative which has entirely escaped Rask.

Remark 2 — One might consider the *ο* of *οποιν* instead of a conjunctive vowel as has been stated above (see § 221) as a property of the base *ι ε* as an unorganic extension of it, or in other words regard it as a transition from the third to the second declension a declension which must then naturally extend itself to the dual termination *ον* of the whole third declension (*τοσιον βοτρυνον δαιμόνιον* like *λυκον*) and to all cases in the formation of words and arrangement of the same where we have represented an *ο* foreign to the proper base as conjunctive vowel. According to this forms like *μελιτοεις μελιτοπωλης ηυσιολογια βοτρυνεις βοτρυοδωρος* would be under the pre-supposition of the bases *MEΛITO IYΣIO BOTPYIO* to be divided into *μελιτο-εις* and would lead us to expect the nominatives *μελιτο-ν* &c. which are not to be found. The statement here given has thus in its favour that similar cases occur also in cognate dialects since in general that declension which is the most in vogue and most used is prone in certain cases to receive into itself the other declensions which annex to their original base the final letters of the bases of the declension more in use. The origin of *οποιν* from *OHIO* of *φεροντον* from *ΦΕΡΟΝΤΙΟ* was as it were the first commencement of the disease which came to its full development in the Pali, since in this language which otherwise closely resembles the Sanskrit the bases which end with consonants are declined

in the old way only in the singular, but in the plural are so corrupted, that, with the exception of the nominative and the vocative of similar sound, and the genitive, which at the same time supplies the place of the dative, they have extended the old base by an unorganic *a* (=Greek *o*), and have thus partly brought it from the Greek third declension into the second, and in the singular, also, most of the cases may, together with the old form, assume more recent forms, which have originated in the manner stated. In this manner, for example, the root चर *char*, "to go," forms its participle present partly from the original base चरन् *charant*, or its corruption चरन् *charat* (see § 129), partly from the augmented theme चरन्त *charanta*, and in part also [G Ed p 319] arbitrarily from चरन् *charant* or चरन्त *charanta*, as follows (see Clough's Pâli Grammar, Colombo 1824, p. 25, and compare Burnouf's and Lassen's Essay, p 112 *et seq*)

	SINGULAR		
Th	CHARANT,	CHARANTA,	CHARAT.
Nom.	<i>charan</i> ,*	<i>charantô</i> ,	
Acc	<i>charant-am</i> ,†		
Instr.		<i>charantê-n-a</i> ,	<i>charat-â</i> .
Dat like the Genitive,			
Abl.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{charanta-smâ}, \\ \text{or } \textit{charanta-mhâ},\ddagger \end{array} \right\} \textit{charat-â} \text{ §}$		

\* The final न *n* is, as in the Piâkrit (§ 10), transmuted into the Anuswâra, which I here express, as in the Sanskrit, by *n*

† It might also be divided thus, *charanta-m* and deduced from *charanta*

‡ Transposed, and with *h* for *s* (comp § 166) These forms are derived from the medial pronoun *sma* mentioned in § 166, which, in the Pâli also, has forced its way into the usual declension The *t*, which was to have been expected, is, as generally happens at the end of a word, suppressed

§ *Charatâ* is, according to appearance, identical with the instrumental, but

SINGULAR			
Th	<i>CHARANT</i>	<i>CHARANTA</i>	<i>CHARAT</i>
Gen		<i>charanta ssa</i>	<i>charat ô</i>
Loc		<i>charantê</i> or <i>charanta smin</i> or <i>charanta mhi</i>	<i>charat i</i>
Voc	<i>charan</i> or <i>chara</i> * or <i>charâ</i>		
PLURAL			
Nom		<i>charanta †</i>	
Acc		<i>charantê</i>	
Inst		<i>charantebhi</i> or <i>charanteha</i>	
Dat	like the Genitive		
Abl	like the Instrumental		
Gen			<i>charat am</i>
Loc		<i>charant' su</i>	
Voc	<i>charantô</i>	<i>charantâ</i>	

[G Ed p 320]

If the Greek in its bases ending with a consonant had followed the declension-confusing example of the Pali one would have expected for instance from *φερων* a genitive *φεροντου* dative *φεροντω* and in the plural indeed *φεροντων* from

but is in reality corrupted from *charat at* analogous with Zend forms like *ap at* (in § 180) the suppressed *t* is replaced by the lengthening of the preceding vowel as in *achara* 'he went' from *acharat* (Clough p 106)

\* If this form really belongs to a theme in *nt* as I believe it has sprung from the original form *charan* by suppression of the concluding nasal (comp. Burnouf and Lassen p 39) and in *charâ* this deficiency is replaced by lengthening the vowel

† According to the usual declension ending with a consonant one would expect with *charanta* also *charanto* from the original theme *charant* as for example *gunatanto* is used with *gunatantâ* the virtuous the former from *gunatant* the latter from *gunatanta*



in the old way only in the singular, but in the plural are so corrupted, that, with the exception of the nominative and the vocative of similar sound, and the genitive, which at the same time supplies the place of the dative, they have extended the old base by an inorganic *a* (=Greek *o*), and have thus partly brought it from the Greek third declension into the second, and in the singular, also, most of the cases may, together with the old form, assume more recent forms, which have originated in the manner stated. In this manner, for example, the root च॒ char, "to go," forms its participle present partly from the original base चरन्त् charant, or its corruption चरन् charat (see § 129), partly from the augmented theme चरन्त charanta, and in part also [G Ed p 319] arbitrarily from चरन्त् charant or चरन्त charanta, as follows (see Clough's Pâli Grammar, Colombo 1824, p. 25, and compare Burnouf's and Lassen's Essay, p 112 et seq)

	SINGULAR		
Th	CHARANT,	CHARANTA,	CHARAT
Nom.	charan,*	charantô,	. .
Acc	charant-am,†	. .	.
Instr.	.	charantê-n-a,	charat-â.
Dat	like the Genitive,		
Abl.	{ charanta-smâ, { or charanta-mhâ,‡ } charat-â §		

\* The final च॒ n is, as in the Piâkrit (§ 10), transmuted into the Anuswâra, which I here express, as in the Sanskrit, by *n*

† It might also be divided thus, *charanta-m* and deduced from *charanta*

‡ Transposed, and with *h* for *s* (comp § 166) These forms are derived from the medial pronoun *sma* mentioned in § 166, which, in the Pâli also, has forced its way into the usual declension. The *t*, which was to have been expected, is, as generally happens at the end of a word, suppressed

§ *Charatû* is, according to appearance, identical with the instrumental, but

SINGULAR			
Th	<i>CHARANI</i>	<i>CHARANTA</i>	<i>CHARAT</i>
Gen		<i>charanta su</i>	<i>charat o</i>
Loc		<i>charantē</i> { or <i>charanta smin</i> } or <i>charanta mhi</i>	<i>charat i</i>
Voc	{ <i>charan</i> or <i>chara*</i> } or <i>chard</i>		
PLURAL			
[G Ed p 320]			
Nom		<i>charantā t</i>	
Acc		<i>charantē</i>	
Instr		{ <i>charantēbhi</i> } or <i>charantelu</i>	
Dat	like the Genitive		
Abl	like the Instrumental		
Gen			<i>charat am</i>
Loc		<i>charant' su</i>	
Voc	<i>charantō</i>	<i>charantā</i>	

If the Greek in its bases ending with a consonant had followed the declension-confusing example of the Pali one would have expected for instance from *φερων* a genitive *φεροντων* dative *φεροντις* and in the plural indeed *φεροντων* from

but is in reality corrupted from *charat-at* analogous with Zend forms like *ap-at* (in § 180) the suppressed *t* is replaced by the lengthening of the preceding vowel as in *achar i*, he went from *acharat* (Clough, p 106)

If the form really belongs to a theme in *nt* as I believe it has sprung from the original form *cl'aran* by suppression of the concluding nasal (comp Burnouf and Lassen p 29) and in *chara* this deficiency is replaced by lengthening the vowel

† According to the usual declension ending with a consonant one would expect with *cl'arantē* also *charantē* from the original theme *cl'arant* as for example, *gunarant* faused with *gunarant i* the vir tuons the former from *gunarant* the latter from *qi naranta*

ΦΕΡONT, but *φέροντοι*, *φέροντους*, *φέροντοισ*, from ΦΕΡONTO. In this manner the form *φέρόντων* in the dual, which has been lost in Pāli, would be clearly explained as derived from ΦΕΡONTO, but even when standing isolated, *φέρόντων* may be justly referred to a theme ΦΕΡONTO, as the first commencement of a corruption which was further pursued in the Pāli, and I prefer this view of the matter now to that laid down at §. 221. Both views, however, concur so far, and thus much of my opinion may be looked on as proved, that in *φέρόντων*, and all other dative-genitive forms of the third declension, the *o* belongs neither to the original theme, which lies at the root of all the other cases, nor to the true case-suffix.

[G Ed p 321]		SINGULAR			
	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>Gothic</i>
N.	<i>bharan</i> ,	<i>baran-s</i> ,	<i>feren-s</i> ,	<i>φέρων</i> ,	<i>fiyand-s</i> *
Ac	<i>bharant-am</i> ,	<i>barēnt-ēm</i> ,	<i>ferent-em</i> ,	<i>φέρωντ-α(ν)</i> ,	<i>fiyand</i> .
Ins.	<i>bharat-ā</i> ,	<i>barēnt-a</i> ,	....	....	D I <i>fiyand</i>
D	<i>bharat-ē</i> ,	<i>barēnt-ē</i> ,	see Locat,	see Loc.	see Dat.
Ab.	see Gen.	<i>barant-at</i> ,	<i>ferent-e(d)</i> ,	. . .	. . .
G.	<i>bharat-as</i> ,	<i>barēnt-ō</i> ,†	<i>ferent-is</i> ,	<i>φέρωντ-ος</i> ,	<i>fiyand-is</i> †
L	<i>bharat-i</i> ,	<i>barēnt-i</i> ,	D. <i>ferent-i</i> ,	D <i>φέρωντ-i</i> ,	. . .
V.	<i>bharan</i> ,	<i>baran-s</i> ,	<i>feren-s</i> ,	<i>φέρων</i> ,	<i>fiyand</i>

\* *Ferend*, "foe," as "hater," see § 125 p 138

† See p 210 Note §, with *cha*, *barēntas-cha* ("ferentisque")

‡ I imagined, p 210, that I must, in this case, which before was not proved to exist in *ND* bases, set down *fiyand-s* as a mutilation of *fiyand-is* from *fiyand-as*, according to the analogy of other bases terminating with a consonant (*ahmīn-s*, *brōthr-s*, § 191), Grimm has (I. 1017.) conjectured *fryōndis* or *fryōnds* from *fryōnds*. Since this, owing to the very valuable additions made by Massmann to our Gothic authorities, the genitive *nasyandis* of *Nasyand* ("preserver, "preserving") has come to light (see his Glossary, p 153), by analogy with which I form *fiyand-is*.



	SINGULAR				
	Sanskrit	Zend	Latin	Greek	Gothic
N	âtma'	ašma'	sermo'	δαίμων,	ahma.
Acc	âtman-am,	a'man-əm,	sermon-em,	δαίμον-ε (v),	a'haman
Inst	âtman-a,	ašman-a,		.. D I	ahman (§ 132)
Dat	âtman-i,	ašman-i,	see Loc	see Loc	.. Dative
Abl	see Gen	a'man-at,	sermon-e(d),	..	
Gen	âtman-as,	ašman-ō,	sermon-es,	δαίμον-ος,	ahman- (§ 132)
Loc	âtman-i,	ašman-i, D.	sermon-i,	δαίμον-i,	
Voc	âtman,	ašman.	sermo'	δαίμων,	ahma'

	PLURAL			
	Sanskrit	Zend	Greek	Gothic
N Acc Voc	âtman-au,	ašman-āo, or ašman-a,	δαίμον-ε	
	Vêda, âtmân-a,			
Inst. D Ab.	âtma'-bhyam,	a'ma'-hya,	D G	ðaimōn-a †
Gen. Loc	âtman-os,	ašman-ōz (p 276, R 1),		

	NUMERAL				
	Sanskrit	Zend	Latin	Greek	Gothic
N V	âtman-as,	a'man-o,*	sermon-ēs,	δαίμον-ες,	ahman-es
Ac.	âtman-as,	ašman-ō,*	sermon-ēs,	δαίμον-ας,	ahman-es
Inst	âtma'-bhis,	ašma'-bis,		(ðaimōnon-ēn),	D I ahmo'-mz
D Ab.	âtma'-bhyas,	ašma'-byō,	sermon-i-bus,		
Gen.	âtman-ām,	ašman-ām,	sermon-um,	δαίμόν-ωι,	ahman-a'
Loc	âtma'-su,	ašma'-hva,		δαίμόν-σι,	

[G Ed p 324]

SINGULAR

	Sanskrit	Zend	Latin	Greek	Gothic
N.	bhrātā,	brāta,	frater,	πατήρ,	brōthar
Acc.	bhātar-am,	brātai-əm,§	fratē-ēm,	πατέρ-α(v),	brōthar

\* *Āśmanas-cha*, "celique" † See p 299, Rem 2 ‡ See p 241, Note †§ Also  $\text{𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀}$  *brāthi-ēm* might be expected, as Vend Sāde, p 377,  $\text{𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀}$  *pati-em* (*pathi-ēm*?), contrary to the theory of the strong cases (§ 129), for *patari-ēm*

**SINGULAR**

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>Gothic</i>
In	<i>bhratr á</i>	<i>bráthr a</i>		D	Inst <i>brothr</i> (see § 132)
D	<i>bhrátr é</i>	<i>bráthr e,</i>	see Loc	see Loc	
Ab	see Gen	<i>bráthr at</i>	<i>fratr e(d)</i>		
G	<i>bhrátur</i>	<i>bráthr ó*</i>	<i>fratr is</i>	<i>πατρ-ος</i>	<i>brothr s</i> (see § 132)
L.	<i>bhradar i</i>	<i>bráthr i †</i>	D <i>fratr i</i>	<i>πατρ i</i>	
V	<i>bhrátar</i>	<i>brátare ‡</i>	<i>frater</i>	<i>πατερ</i>	<i>brothar</i>

## DEAL

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Greek</i>
N Acc Voc	bhrutar au Ved bhrátar a	bratar-áo or brátar a,	πατερ ε
Inst D Ab	bhrátri bhyám	bratar-e bya	πατερο n
Gen Loc	bhratr os	bruthr-o(?)	

FLURAL 6

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek</i>
Nom Voc	<i>bhratar aṣ</i>	<i>bratar ó   </i>	<i>fratr es</i>	πατερ-ες
Accus	<i>bhrātri n ¶</i>	<i>brāthr eus***</i>	<i>fratr es</i>	πατερ ας
Insti	<i>bhrātri bhis</i>	<i>brātar ē bis</i>		[G Ed p 32.]
Dat Abl	<i>bhrātri bhyas</i>	<i>bratar ē-byō</i>	<i>fratr i bus,</i>	
Genitive	<i>bhratri n am</i>	<i>brāthr anm,††</i>	<i>fratr um</i>	πατερ ων
Locative	<i>bhratri shu</i>			πατρα σι

\* Vide § 194 p 211 l 1 Note

† See p 216 Note II

‡ Sec 6 44

§ For the Gothic which is here wanting see p 253 Note f

|| *urwuwurwuw* brátaras cha, *fiatres pue*

¶ See § 17 Note

\*\* Perhaps also *bratl r ó bráthras cha* ( *fratresque* ) according to the analogy of *áthr o ignes* from *atar*. See § 239.

†† See p 266 Note †

		SINGULAR		
	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>Latin</i>
N. A V.	<i>manas,</i>	<i>manō.*</i>	<i>μένος,</i>	<i>genus.</i>
Instr	<i>manas-ā,</i>	<i>mananh-a,†</i>	. .	.
Dat	<i>manas-ē,</i>	<i>mananh-ē,</i>	sec Loc.	see Loc
Abl	see Gen.	<i>mananh-at,</i>	.	<i>gener-e(d)</i>
Gen.	<i>manas-as,</i>	<i>mananh-ō (mananhaś-cha),</i>	<i>μένε(σ)-ος,</i>	<i>gener-is.</i>
Loc.	<i>manas-i,</i>	<i>manah-i,(see p 316, G ed.) D</i>	<i>μένε(σ)-ι,</i>	<i>gener-i</i>

\* *Manas'-cha*, "*mensque*," "*mentemque*"

† M Burnouf remarks, in his review (in the separate impression, p. 11), that in this class of words the instrumental ending is generally long I, in like manner, had remarked forms enough of this kind with a long *ā*, but in passages where also many *a*'s, originally short, appear to be lengthened at the termination, and which, therefore, I was not willing to bring into account moreover, the cases could not be included, where, through the particle *cha*, a preceding *ā* is preserved in its original length After deducting these two classes from forms in *anhā*, the computation might perhaps turn out in favour of the short *a* given above I have, however, as yet not applied any closer reckoning it would, however, surprise me if, on more exact calculation, but still in departure from the fate of other polysyllabic words ending with a shortened *a*, the advantage in this particular case should incline to the side of those words which retain the long vowel, which I would then gladly restore No one will deny that the collation of MSS is of great importance in deciding many grammatical and orthographical questions, although I believe I may assert that even a single lithographed MS opens a rich field to inquiries and important grammatical observations for although it is very full of errors, it nevertheless shews no systematic opposition to what is correct, and many expressions, passages, and turns recur so frequently, that, taken together, they can in a measure supply the place of a comparison of other MSS For the rest I had at my command the edition of Olshausen of the three first chapters and part of the fourth of the Vendidad, with the various readings attached to it, so that, through these means, I was not left entirely destitute of MSS

	Sanskrit	DUAL	Zend	[G Ed p 326]	Greek
N Ac V	<i>manas i</i>				<i>μειε(σ) ε</i>
I D Ab	<i>manō bhydm</i>		<i>mune bya</i> (p 316 G ed)	D G	<i>μειε(σ)ο ιν *</i>
G L	<i>manas ōs</i>		<i>mananh o(?)</i> (p 297 G ed)		

	Sanskrit	DUAL	Zend	Greek	Latin
N Ac V	<i>manans-i</i>		<i>mananh a †</i>	<i>μειε(σ) α</i>	<i>gener a</i>
Instr	<i>mano bhis</i>		<i>mane-bis</i>	<i>(μειεσ φιν)</i>	
Dat Abl	<i>manō bhyas</i>		<i>mane-byō</i>	see Loc	<i>gener i bus</i>
Genitive	<i>manas am</i>		<i>mananh am</i>	<i>μειε(σ) ων</i>	<i>gener um</i>
Locative	<i>manas su</i>		<i>mano hia</i>	<i>μειεσ σι</i>	

	Sanskrit	DUAL	Zend	[G Ed p 327]	Greek
Nom	<i>durmanās</i>		<i>dushmanō</i> (§ 56 <sup>b</sup> )		<i>δυσμειης</i> (§ 146)
Accus	<i>durmanas-am</i>		<i>dushmananh em</i>		<i>δυσμειε(σ) α(ν)</i>
Voc	<i>durmanas</i>				<i>δυσμειες</i>

The rest like the simple word

	Sanskrit	DUAL	Zend	[G Ed p 327]	Greek
N Ac V	<i>durmanas du</i>				
Ved <sup>1</sup>	<i>durmanas a, †</i>		<i>dushmananh a (?)</i>		<i>δυσμειε(σ) ε</i>

The rest like the simple word

	Sanskrit	DUAL	Zend	[G Ed p 327]	Greek
N Voc	<i>durmanas as</i>		<i>dushmananh ō</i> (as cha)		<i>δυσμειε(σ) ες</i>
Accus	<i>durmanas as</i>		<i>dushmananh o</i> (is cha)		<i>δυσμειε(σ) ας</i>

The rest like the simple word

— —

\* See p 299 Rem 2

† See p 245 Note † It was however from an oversight that I as was observed at p 243 Note § read in the Vendidad Sade, p 127 *𐬢𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *nemenha* it should be *𐬢𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *nemanha* and may also be considered the instrumental singular then we should have in this passage which recurs three times the instrumental in *𐬢𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* *anha* in both editions three times with a short *a*

‡ See p 230 Note \*



## SINGULAR, NEUTER

	Sanskrit	Zend	Greek
Nom Ac. V	<i>durmanas,</i>	<i>dushmanō</i> (aš-cha),	<i>δυσμενός</i>
	The rest like the simple word		

“Remark. It was remarked in §. 152 (comp § 146.), that the  $\Sigma$  in forms like *μένος, κύωνες*, belongs to the base, and is not the nominative character, and that the  $\Sigma$  in forms like *τετυφός* has come from  $\tau$ , and in like manner belongs to the theme. M Reimmnitz, who, in (p. 54, &c) his pamphlet mentioned at p 294, G ed, agrees with this view, first given in my treatise “On some Demonstrative Bases,” wishes to look upon the  $\Sigma$  in the masculine *τετυφός* as belonging to the base, and arising out of  $\tau$ , in which I cannot agree with him, as I, according to the view generally taken, consider the final letters of *τετυφός* as marks of the nominative, before

[G Ed p 328] which the final letter of the base is suppressed on account of the incompatible association of  $\tau\sigma$  (comp § 99), and replaced by lengthening the preceding vowel, as, for example, in *μέλας* for *μέλανς*. The Sanskrit has a few bases in  $n$  which, differing from the ruling principle (see § 139.), run parallel in the nominative to the Greek *μέλας*, thus, *panthás*, “the way,” from *panthan*, accusative *panthân-am*. Only in this *panthás* the lengthening of the  $a$  can be less regarded as a compensation for the rejected  $n$  than in the Greek, because it extends also to the other full cases (§. 129), with the exception of the vocative, but perhaps the lengthening of the  $a$  has originally taken place only in the nominative, and has thence imparted itself, when the reason of this prolongation was no longer perceived, to those cases which otherwise stood upon an equal footing with the nominative. Thus one says *महान् mahân*, “great” (from the theme *mahant*, properly a participle present from *मह mah*, “to grow”), with the vowel of the concluding syllable lengthened, according to the analogy of the Greek form, as *λέγων*. The Sanskrit word, however, retains the long vowel

also in the other strong cases (*mahāntam magnum mahāntas magni* " *mahāntāu, μεγαλῷ* ) with the exception of the vocative while the usual participles present leave the *a* short in all the strong cases. In most exact accordance however with the Greek participle present stand the Sanskrit possessive adjectives which are formed by the suffix *ant* (Greek *ειν* for *Feνt* in *μελιτοεις* and others) and *mant* (in the weak cases *ant* *mat*). These lengthen that is to say the *a* only in the nominative singular so for example *dhanaiān dūes* \* (from *dhana* "riches") *dhanaiant am dhanavant āu dhanaiant as as λε μων λεγοντα, λεγοντω λεγοντες*

#### OLD SLAVONIC DECLENSION† [G Pd 1 39]

253 Before we enter upon the province of Slavonic Grammar we must endeavour to explain its system of sounds and although it is not requisite to specify all the minutiae of the subject we must nevertheless bring into notice those parts which are indispensable to the understanding of the Grammar. It is therefore our principal object in the following remarks to exhibit the connection of the Old Slavonic sounds with those of the older languages of which they are either the true trans-

\* If as has been remarked in another place the suffix *ant* has maintained itself in the Latin in the form *lent* (as *opulents*) it would not be surprising if the weak form *ant* *at* without the interchange of *t* with *l* but with the weakening of the *a* to *e* had its representative in the Latin *dūes* which stands in the same relation to *dhanaiat* by passing over the middle syllable as *malo* to *marolo*

† It is stated by Profes or Bopp in the preface to the second published portion of this Grammar commencing with the formation of cases in general that it had not occurred to him to direct his attention at an earlier period to the Slavonic tongues having subsequently considered the subject he found sufficient reason to include them in the same family of languages, and accordingly devotes to its principles of declension the supplementary section which follows — *Editor*

missions, or corruptions more or less vitiated. We give therefore, for the first time, a history of the Slavonic sounds, in which, however, as is natural, as far as their value is concerned, we have nothing new to bring forward, and in this respect follow only the teaching of native grammarians.

(a) The Old Sanskrit  $\alpha$  has so far experienced, in the Slavonic, an exactly similar fate to that which has befallen it in the Greek, that it is most frequently supplied by  $e$  or  $o$  ( $e, o$ ), which are always short; it very rarely remains  $a$ . In the interior of the bases, also,  $e$  and  $o$  are interchanged as in Greek, and as, for example,  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  is related to  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ , so, in the Old Slavonic, is *brod*, "ferry," to *bredŭ*, "I wade through," *voz*, "carriage," to *vexŭ*, "I ride in a carriage." And as, in the Greek, the vocative  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\epsilon$  is related to the theme  $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron$ , so is, in the Old Slavonic, *rabe*, "O slave," to *rabo*, nominative *rab*, "a slave." The  $o$  has more weight than  $e$ , but  $a$  more than  $o$ ; and hence  $a$  corresponds most frequently to a Sanskrit  $\acute{a}$ , so that, for instance, in the Old Slavonic, forms in  $a$  answer to the feminine bases in  $\alpha$  (comp. *vdova*, "widow," with  $\nu\delta\eta\nu\acute{\alpha}$  *vidhavá*), which, in the vocative, is in like manner abbreviated to  $o$  (*vdovo !*), as above  $o$  to  $e$ . As final vowel, also, of the first member of a compound,  $a$  is weakened to  $o$ , for instance, *vodo-pad*, "waterfall," *vodo-poŭ*, "water-drinker," for *voda-*, just as in the Greek  $\text{Μουσo-}\tau\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ ,  $\text{Μουσo-}\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\varsigma$ , and similar compounds, which [G Ed p 330] have shortened the feminine  $\alpha$  or  $\eta$  to  $o$ . Even if, therefore,  $a$  is in the Old Slavonic a short vowel, I nevertheless regard it, in respect to grammar, as the long  $o$ , so that in this the Old Slavonic stands in a reversed relation to the Gothic, in which  $a$  has shewn itself to us as the short of  $\acute{o}$ , and, in case of abbreviation,  $\acute{o}$  would become  $a$ , exactly as in the Old Slavonic  $a$  becomes  $o$ .

(b)— $\alpha$   $i$  and  $\alpha$   $\acute{i}$  both appear in the Old Slavonic as  $i$ , and the difference of the quantity is removed, at least I

do not find that a longer or shorter *i* is anywhere spoken of. Let *schuŭ* I live be compared with *нѣмѣjudm sila* virtue with *शील sila* and on the other hand *vidyati* to see with the root *विद vid* to know \* to the Guna form of which *वेदिŕdm* the Old Slavonic *vyemy* (abbreviated from *vyedmy infia* *vyes t* for *vyed ti*) I know assimilates itself, so that *vid* and *vyed* in the Slavonic appear as two different roots. The short *इ i* however, appears frequently in the Old Slavonic also in the corruption to *e* (*e*) as in the Greek and the Old High German (§ 72) that is to say the bases in *i* shew in several cases *e* for *i* and the numeral three (*त्रि tri*) appears frequently in composition in the form *tre, e g* *trepulye, truum*. So also *pûte sheslye* *οδοροπια* from *PŪTI* (§ 260). The *i* is also very frequently \*suppressed *e g* in the 3d person plural *dadyat* they give Sanskrit *ददति dadati* *sut* they are Sanskrit *सन्ति santi*. Where *i* forms a diphthong with a vowel preceding it it is marked in the old writing with a short mark which we retain, *e g* *boi* strife

- (c) — *ѣ u* and *ѧ u* have in the Old Slavonic in the forms which are retained most correctly both become *y†*. In this manner for instance *by* (*iasu by ti*) answers to *व*

\* The suppression here noticed of final *i* refers to Dobrowsky's incorrect orthography. In point of fact, however the final *i* in Old Slavonic has either been retained unaltered or has become *i y e g* that which Dobrowsky here writes *da hat* they give *sŭt* they are should be corrected to *ДАВѦТИ, dadanty* *САРИ suty*. Regarding the nasalized vowels see § 783 Remark.

† We express, as in Polish the *very* or dull *i* by *y* as like the Greek *υ* where it is original it supplies the place of the old short or long *u*. It is pronounced in Russian according to Reiff (by Cretsch II p 666) as in the French *oui*, spoken very short and monosyllabically according to Heym nearly like *u* in union with a very short *i* (Heym p 6). This does not however remain the same in all positions of this letter (Reiff l c) and it sounds after consonants other than labials like a dull thick *i* (*i sourd et étouffé*).

*bhū*, "to be," *svekrīy*, "mother-in-law," to *बृहद्वांसि ई*; *myshy*, "mouse," to *मूष मूषा*; *syn*, "son," to *सूनु सूनू*, *chetyri*, *τέσσαρες*, with *चतुर् chatu* (in the theme), nominative masculine *चतुर्षु chatuśas*. The instances of *y* for *उ u* are, nevertheless, more rare than those where *y* corresponds to the long *ऊ ū*; for the short *u*, as in the Old High German (§. 70.), has for the most part

[G Ed p 331] become *o*, and thus, for example, *snocha*, "daughter-in-law," answers to *सुषा snushā*, *oba*, "both," to *उभा ubhā* (Vêdic form), Zend *ubā*. Hence, also, the old *u* declension has, in many cases, become similar to the *o* declension, which, according to (*a*), has arisen from *अ a*, and, on the other side, *o* may also, but only in substantives, participate in those forms which belong only to the genuine *u* declension whence it is easily perceived that the genius of the language could not everywhere distinguish further the two kinds of *o*, in their history, indeed, far separated from one another, but phonetically identical.

- (*d*)—Unorganic *y*, i e *y* as representative of original vowels other than *उ u* or *ऊ ū*, is not uncommon in the grammar, that is to say, the personal termination *my* (1st person plural), like the Latin *mus*, has arisen from the more ancient *mas*; and if the bases in *a* (for *अ ā*) have *y* in the nominative plural (*vdovy*, "*viduæ*"), still the *y* here is so much the less to be looked upon as a case termination, as no account could be given of *y* in this sense, and with bases in *ya* the *a* of the base is also really retained (*volya*, "*voluntates*"). But as the *y* exerts the force of an *Umlaut* on an *o* succeeding it, by which that vowel is changed to an *e*, so I think that to an *i* following the *o*, without the intervention of another letter, the force of a reactive *Umlaut* must be ascribed, even if this force is not everywhere exerted, and that some *y*'s must be declared to be the *Umlauts* of *o* that is to say, as soon as so much has been re-

cognised in the Old Slavonic adjectives that their bases all end either in *o* or *yo* (changed by the *Umlaut* to *ye*) and are thus sister forms to the Greek like ΑΓΙΟ and of the Sanskrit as *श्वेत* *suēta* white *दिव्य* *divya* heavenly —so soon I say, as the abbreviation of the base in the masculine nominative has been recognised (*not notus* for *noto*) then will it be no longer said with Dobrowsky (p 318) that the definite adjectives are derived from the primitives (indefinite) by anaexing according to the measure of the final letter of the primitive either *y* or *u* \* If however I may trust that I have obtained an accurate knowledge of the organization of the Old Slavonic grammar on any point it is on this that the affix *ia* the nominative singular of definite adjectives consists not in *yī* or *u* but in *z* as a mutilation of *yo* from *ya* (य *ya*) and in the feminine of *ya* from *yā* [G Ed p 332] (या *yā*) This also appears to me subject to no manner of doubt that if for example the compound word *svyatyi* comes from the word *svyato* holy its acknowledged theme, the *y* is a euphonic product from *o* through the *ia* fluence of the *z* which is added to it This *z* has in some cases in which it has been dropped still in a degree in its euphonic operation left its reflection and thereby the proof of its former existence Thus for instance *sviaty-m per sanctum* from the older *sviatyīm* *sviaty ch sanctorum* and *in sanctis* from *sviatyi ch* corresponds to the indefinite forms *svyato m sviatye ch* (for *sviato-ch*) † At times through the said pronominal syllable *z* the preceding *o* may be changed at will into *y*

\* Dobr also himself p 493 considers simple *z* or *u* as the definitive adjunct but in considering as he there does *blagy* as the confluence of *blag* and *u* he appears to look upon the *y* as having arisen from the *z* of the suffix and not to acknowledge in it the final vowel of the simple adjective root

† In the oldest MSS according to Dobr p 50<sup>o</sup> the more full forms *y ch, ym y m* occur in the plural for *ym ych, ym*

or not thus the interrogative exhibits the forms *kyí*, "*quis*?" (Dobr. 500 and 343.), *kyim*, "*per quem*?" *kyích*, "*in quibus, quorum*?" *kyim*, "*quibus*?" *kyimi*, "*per quos*?" with *koř*, *koim*, *koich*, *koimi*. The possessive pronouns allow no euphonic reaction at all to the demonstrative *i*, which forms the last member of them, and they always retain their radical *o*, e g. *moř*, "*meus*," *moim*, "*per meum*," not *myř*, *myim*. As to the definite form of the adjective bases in *yo*, which Dobrowsky forms through the addition of *ř*, I have not the slightest doubt that here, also, a simple *i* is the defining element, for the first *i* is clearly the vocalization of the *y* of the primitive base; so that therefore, for example, *sinř* "the blue," is to be divided, not into *sin-ř*, but into *sin-i-ř*. The primitive adjective is sounded in the nominative which is deprived of all inflection and of the last vowel of the base *siny*, the *y* of which appears as *i* in the nominative plural masculine, just as in the definite pronoun, *sinu*, "*cærulei*," *sinu, oi* "*cærulei*." In order, however, here fully to explain the nature and origin of the definite declension, and not hereafter to be compelled to repeat what is already settled, it may be stated that its pronominal defining addition is identical with the Sanskrit relative base *ya*, which is most correctly preserved in the Lithuanian, in which language *\*ya* signifies "he" (*ya-m*, "to him," *ya-mē*, "in him") The nominative *ys*, "he" (for *yas*), has given the *y* an assimilating influence, as is the case with all bases in *ya* (§. 135.) The feminine, also, *is* pronounced in the nominative, through assimilation, *yi* for *ya*, but the genitive *yos*, and all the other cases, are easily perceived through the declension of *rankà*, "hand," and *giesme*, "song,"

[G Ed p 333] from *GIESMYA* (p. 169, Note) The

\* Written *ja* in the text This passage furnishes a good reason for writing the Germanic *j* by *y*, as has been done throughout this translation

Old Slavonic has, in all the masculine bases ending with a vowel, suppressed this vowel in the nominative and accusative and since the vowel has dropped from the Sanskrit-Lithuanian base  $\pi ya ya$ —which according to (a) makes one expect  $yo$  in the Old Slavonic from which, according to (n) must be formed  $ye^*$ —the  $y$  must be changed into a vowel, hence,  $z$ , he him,' which must, therefore on no account be placed together with the Latin Gothic  $is$  from the base  $z$ . In the nominative singular masculine, however this Slavonic pronoun occurs in all the three genders, not isolated but in union with the particle *sche* which has preserved to it the old relative meaning  $z$  *sche* means as well "*qui* as *quem*  $ya$  *sche*, *quæ'*  $yû$  *sche* *quam*", and  $ye$  *sche* *quod*. Now as  $z$  means he,  $ya$ , she and  $ye$ , it I could not imagine how one could create the definitive adjective forms  $zyaty$   $z$   $zyata$   $ya$   $zyato$   $e$  (for  $zyatoye$ ) accusative  $zyaty$   $z$   $zyatû-yû$   $zyato$   $e$  in their opposition to the indefinites  $zyat(ô)$   $zyata$ ,  $zyato$ , differently from Dobrowsky (p 493) and perhaps other grammarians before him have done, namely by the addition of the pronoun here under discussion † for this pronominal suffix supplies the place of the article of other languages and the Lithuanian language uses the same pronoun

\* Hence in the genitive  $ye-go$  dative  $ye mû$  loc  $ye m$  the  $e$  of which Dobrowsky wrongly ascribes to flexion because he everywhere seeks the base in the nominative. However the base  $ye$  has not fully maintained itself before all terminations beginning with a consonant but become in like manner shortened to  $z$  in  $z m$  *per eum* and  $us z m$  *per eos*  $z ch$  *eorum* in  $us$  for  $ye m$  &c

† What Grimm (by Wuk p xl) remarks against this declaration has not convinced me least of all can I for the above reasons concede to him that the  $z$  of  $zyaty$  has any thing to do with the  $a$  of *blin la* the blind (from *blndan* § 110) so that  $zyaty$  would belong to the indefinite declension and on the other hand,  $zyat$  contrary to the Slavonic Grammarians would be to be removed from the indefinite into the definite forms



for the same object, *i.e.* equally in the emphatic, or, as it is also termed, definite declension of the adjective, and certainly so, that, through all cases, both the adjective which precedes and the pronoun which concludes are declined, while, in the Slavonic, in most cases the pronoun only is provided with the inflexions of case, but in some

[G. Ed p 331] it has utterly disappeared, and in others is still to be recognised in the *y* for *o* mentioned above

(e.) The Sanskrit diphthong  $\tau \acute{e}$  I have found always rendered, in the Old Slavonic, by *ye*, in similar forms, so that after weakening the  $\tau \acute{e}$ , to compensate for this, the semi-vowel *y* has made its appearance, to which, in this union, a particular legitimacy would be, according to (c), to be ascribed. Let *pyena*, "foam," be compared with  $\phi \acute{e} n a$  *phēna*, *svet* "light," with  $\acute{s} v \acute{e} t a$ ; *vyemy*, "I know," with  $\acute{v} \acute{e} d m i$ . The most important cases in the grammar with *ye* corresponding to  $\tau \acute{e}$  are the dual case forms of the feminine and neuter, and those of the imperative, in accordance with the Sanskrit potential of the first conjugation.

(f) The Sanskrit diphthong  $\text{औ} \acute{o}$  (from *a+u*) is represented in the Old Slavonic by  $\hat{u}$  (*g*),\* so that the first

\* Although this vowel may at times be pronounced short, still this much, at least, is certain, that, according to its origin and its definition, it is long. In Bohemian it appears in two forms, as *au* and *u* the former is pronounced *ou*, but the writing points to an older and different pronunciation, in which the *a* was accurately preserved in its place the *u* is pronounced short, whence, however, it cannot be deduced that this short *u* perhaps corresponds to the Sanskrit  $\text{उ} u$  and Greek  $\upsilon$ , and that *au* is its intensive or Guna, but, on the contrary, only the *u* retained in the *au* corresponds to the Sanskrit  $\text{उ} u$ , and the *u* which stands alone in Bohemian is a weakening of the *au*, so that, from this, the concluding element *u* alone is left etymologically, that is to say, the Bohemian *au*, as also *u*, answers to the Sanskrit  $\text{औ} \acute{o}$ , and also to the Slavonic  $\hat{u}$  (*g*), only that the former is phonetically more exact, and without the loss brought about by time. Hence, also, *usta* (written *vsta*) "*oua*" corresponds to the Sanskrit  $\text{औष्ठ} \acute{o}shṭha$ , "the lip" more complete, however, is *austne*, "by word

element of the Indian diphthong has assimilated itself to the second and in conjunction with it presents a similar long vowel as in the Greek *ε* (*ov*) two heterogeneous vowels according to pronunciation have united themselves in a similar measure. As according to (a) the Indian short *a* has in the Slavonic mostly become short *o* we must consider the first element in the diphthong *ū* also (so we write the *ε*) to be *o* and it becomes visible too in this form when *ū* is resolved before vowels into *oi* (compare *βo(F)os* from *BS* [G Ed p 335] § 123) while the Indian *ओ* *o* becomes *av* before a vowel (*गवि* *gavi* = *βoFi* from *गो* *go*). Now as in the Sanskrit *उ* *u* rise to *ō* through Guna (§ 26) and *sto shyām* appears as the future of *stu* so in the Old Slavonic in like manner *y* (*cy*) is interchanged with *u* so that *bu* in *bū du* I shall be must pass as the Guna form of *by* (in *byti* to be) but if a class of nouns which in the nominative accusative terminate in a consonant or in *yerr* (see *l*) exhibit in many oblique cases the syllable *ov* before vowel-endings this *ov* must neither be considered with Dobrowsky for an augment added to the base nor can it be deduced from forms like *synov* from a son (Sanskrit *सूनवे* *sunai e* from *sunu*) *synov-ē* sons (*सूनवसु* *sunav as*) that *syn* in the nominative-accusative is an abbreviation of *synū* and that therefore the *yerr* when it is added to the form *syn* is a representative or weak remainder of *ū* but it is clear from (c) that *syn* *filius* *filium* if its final vowel in its most genuine form had remained to it would sound *syny*, from which *synov* is the Guna intensive the *oi* of which has arisen from *u* through the influence

of mouth and even for *ista* is to be found *austa* (Dobr Bohm Lebrg p 4) *ruka* corresponds to the Lithuanian *ranka* "hand" and *hus* to the Sanskrit *हंस* *hansa* goose for which according to p 319 *rauha* *haus* was to have been expected. A distinction must here according to § 783 Remark q 1, be made between *oy* 1, and *ū* *un*

of the vowel following it, but has remained in the genitive plural also, after the ending has been dropped. Let *synov*, "*filiorum*," be compared with the Gothic *sunw-ê* (§. 247) As, in the Sanskrit, the substantive bases in *u* adopt the Guna form of the *u* before the vowels of the derivative suffix, so it is very remarkable that, in the Old Slavonic bases in *y*, also, this vowel appears before certain derivative suffixes in its Guna form, e. g. *domov-ŭl* from *dom* (*DOMY*), "house", *binov-at*, "debtor," from *byn* (*BYNY*).<sup>\*</sup> Derivative substantives and adjectives in *ov*, *ev* (theme *ovo*, *evo*, the latter for *yovo*, see *n*), correspond to the Sanskrit in अव *ava*; as पान्दव *pāṇḍav-a* (nominative *as*), "descendant of Pāṇḍu", अर्तव *ārtava*, "seasonable," from ऋतु *ritu*, "season" so, in Old Slavonic, *Adamov*, "Adamite," from *Adam* (*ADAMY*), *zarev* for *zaryev*, "kingly," from *zar* (theme *ZARYY*). For these formations, therefore, we must not, with Dobrowsky (322, 323), assume a suffix *ov* or *ev*, but we must look upon the *o* alone, which, in the nominative, is suppressed, as the derivative suffix (*ADAMOV-O*, *ZAREV-O*). Through the Viddhi increase (§ 29.) the Old Slavonic *y* becomes *av*, because *a*, according to (*a*), usually corresponds to आ *ā* hence, from the root *by*, "to be," comes the causal *baviti* (infinitive), as in the

[G Ed p 336] Sanskrit भावयितुम् *bhāvayitum*. But though *staviti* occurs as the causal of *sta*, this form may have arisen in the perverted feeling of the language as an irregularly analogous word to *baviti*. In order, then, still more to establish, by a few other examples, the representation of the Indian ओ *ô* or अव *av* by the Slavonic *i*, we find *úst*, "mouth," correspond to ओष्ठ *ôṣṭha*, "lip", *shûi* "sinister" (theme *SHUYO*), to सव्य *savya*, *bûditi*, "to awake" a causal, whose primitive *bdyeti* has entirely

\* Dobrowsky supports himself in these cases by calling *ov* a prefix (p 329)

lost the vowel of the root—to बोधयिषुम् *bōdhayitum* also to awake from बुध् *budh* to know Thus *gubiti* is the causal of *gyb nŭ* (1 P) and *stŭditi* of *styd nŭ* (Dobr 360 361) while *ŭyesiti* is the causal of *ŭsyeti* (see *e*) as in the Sanskrit वेष्टयिषुम् *vēṣayitum* 'to cruse to enter' from विश् *viś* to go in

- (g)—As the nasals\* easily resolve themselves into *u* so the second element of the diphthong *ŭ* sometimes also supplies the place of a nasal in the cognate languages *e g rŭka* a hand Lithuanian *ranka* *pŭty* a way Sanskrit पथि *panthās* id Latin *pons* *goluby* a dove *columba* *gŭsy* a goose" रस *hansa* Tho Polish has preserved the old nasal in *golamb* a dove *gansic* a gosling *ganstor* a gander and in many similar cases Hereby the *ŭ* in the accusative of bases in *a* (from एा *ŭ*) which are for the most part feminine is remarkably explained compare *idoŭŭ* from *idora* a widow with विधवा *vidhatām* *iduom* Therefore *idoŭŭ* is to be derived from *idovo-m* for *idoŭo m* (see *o*) so that the *a* which is weakened to an *o* is contracted with the nasal mark of the case to *ŭ* This view is further supported by the consideration that in Polish also the corresponding feminine declension marks the final vowel of the base with the same sign which in the middle of a word expresses a nasal which is governed according to the organ of the following letter but at the end probably through a corruption of sound is said to have an equal value with a ringing *h* This nasalizing mark recurs also in the Polish verb and indeed exactly in such a place where one had to expect a nasal *i e* in the 1st person singular and 3d person plural and thus in Baadtke's second and third conjugation the so marked *ę e g* in *piekę* I bake supplies the place of the *am* of the first conjugation as *czytam* I read

\* Cf § 783 Remark

The Old Slavonic has, however, excepting some anomalous remains of an older formation, *ŭ* in all the conjugations, and, according to what has been said, it admits of no doubt, that in the second part of this diphthong (*o + ŭ*) the personal character *m*, and in the first part of the diphthong the conjunctive vowel, is retained. When therefore, in the 1st person, an *o* corresponds to the *e* (*c*) of *nes-e-shi*, "thou carriest," *nes-e-t*, "he carries"

[G Ed p. 337.] for *nesŭ* is for *nes-o-ŭ* for *nes-o-m* from *nes-e-m* it must be assumed that the conjunctive vowel *e*, before its confluence with the *ŭ*, which has arisen out of *m*, has passed into *o*; as in Greek *ou* arises by the contraction of *ε* and *ο*, though the transition of *ε* into *ο* and *ο* into *υ*. The same relation is to be found in the Old Slavonic in the 3d person plural, where, corresponding to *nes-e-m*, "we carry," *nes-e-te*, "ye carry" (comp *λέγ-ε-τε*), the form *nesent* is expected, but in place of it occurs *nesŭt* in surprising accord with the Greek *λέγουσι* for *λέγονσι* from *λέγοντι*. The Polish has, like the Bohemian, relinquished the character of the 3d person in the plural, as well as for the most part in the singular, but everywhere retains, in the first, the old and more powerful *a* (ᄋ), and marks this with the diacritical sign mentioned above, which, in the middle of a word, supplies the place of a nasal function, thus, *sa*, "they are," corresponds to the Sanskrit *सन्ति* *santi*, Slavonic *sŭt*. The Bohemian has also, in many conjugations, retained the old conjunctive vowel *a* in the 3d person plural, but, like the Slavonic, permitted the *n* to dissolve into a *u*, therefore, in *uczau*, "vehunt" (*wecz-e-me*, "vehimus," *wecz-e-te*, "vehitis"), the *u* answers to the *n* of *वहन्ति* *vahanti*, "vehunt," and the *u* which, in Bohemian, is united with an *a*, is essentially different from that which stands alone, for the latter answers to the Old Slavonic diphthong *ŭ* (*z*), but the former only to the latter portion of the *ŭ*, which, in the Old Slavonic, never stands alone, at least never occurs as *ŭ*, but as *y* (*č*)

If, then through what has been said the vocalization of the *m* or *n* which is of such frequent occurrence in the Slavonic has been shewn with sufficient clearness it is remarkable that conversely also the latter portion of the *ŕ* (*z*) has occasionally been hardened into a nasal and thus *budu* I will be is in Polish *bendź* (written *będe*)

(h)—In certain cases an old *d* (ѣ) unorganically supplies the place of the Slavonic *ŕ*, *z* in the instrumental of pronouns without gender and all feminines thus *vdovoy u* through the widow answers to विधवा *vidha vay ŕ* and *toboy u* through thee to त्वया *tway ŕ* Denominatives also in *ŕyŕ* (1st per pres) in the Old Slavonic correspond to the Sanskrit in जायामि *ŕyāmi* as शब्दयामि *śabdāyāmi* I sound from शब्द *śabda* a sound चिरयामि *chirāyāmi* I hesitate from चिर *chira* long thus in the Slavonic, *zielŕyŕ* I greet, I kiss, from *ziel* (*ZIELLO*) "healthy *ŕdovŕyŕ* from *ŕdova*, widow (Dobr p 372) Finally words in *ŕn* (*ŪNO*) answer as it appears to the Sanskrit participles of the middle voice, in *ŕna* as युज्जान *yunjāna* uniting from युज् *yuj* so in the Old Slavonic, *perŕn* (*PERŪNO*) *Deus* [G Ed p 338] *tonans* from the root *per* to shake *byegŕn*, runner (*BYEGŪNO*) from *BĚG* "to run (Dobr p 289)

(i)—There are in the Slavonic alphabet two marks which by some are called *litteræ aphonæ* but by Gretsch semi vowels, I mean the so-called soft *yer*\* and the hard *yerr*. The former is represented by Gretsch as half *z* and by his translator Reiff (47) as answering to the tones mouilles of French (compare Kopitar p 5) and thus *schal*<sup>b</sup> "sympathy and *ogon*<sup>b</sup> fire are in respect to the soft *yer* compared with the pronunciation of *travail* and *cicogne*. This *yer*, therefore denotes a tone

\* In the original *yer* pronounced however, *yerr* and hence *y* has been substituted for *j* in all that follows —*Editor*

which is rather to be called a *y* than an *i*\*; and it may be said that in *schal*<sup>b</sup> and *oġon*<sup>b</sup> one hears quite as much of a *y* as can be heard of this semi-vowel after a consonant preceding it. Hence we mark it with a *y*, and write the above words *schaly*, *ogony*, Old Slavonic *ogny*. In the words, too, which end with it in the uninflected nominative and accusative singular, it occurs in several oblique cases as a distinct proper *y*, e g in *zarya*, “*regis*,” *zaryu*, “*regi*,” from *zary*, “*rex*,” “*regem*.” On the consonant which precedes it this *yer* has an influence which renders its pronunciation more mild, because its sound is somewhat broken by the *y*, which throws back its sound. Etymologically the *yer* corresponds either to a final *i* of the cognate languages, as in *yesty*, “he is” (अस्ति *asti*, *esti*, Lithuanian *esti*), *kosty*, “bones” (अस्थि *asthi*), or in the nominative and accusative singular of masculine substantives and adjectives, to a *y* (य *y*), from which a vowel has dropped, for the theme of *syny*, “*cæruleus*,” concludes neither with *i* nor with *y*, but with *yo* (euphonically *ye*, see *n*), whose final vowel, suppressed in the nominative and accusative masculine, appears, however, in the feminine *synya*, in its extension to *a*, while the neuter *sine* for *synye* has rejected the *y*.

- (*k*) The hard *yerr* is represented by Gretsche as a semi *o*, but by Reiff, more correctly in my opinion, it is compared to the French silent *e* and the Hebrew *schva* it is therefore, to use the expression, equivalent to “nothing”, and one cannot perceive of what vowel the small, still perhaps remaining vowel part of it is the residue. Consonants preceding it have a stronger and free pronunciation, [G. Ed. p 339] and Kopitar (p 5) tells us that they are pronounced before it sharp, and without echo, and that it is for this reason called the hard *yerr*, and not on account of its own pronunciation. We require, therefore, in the

In the Carniolan dialect this sound has mostly disappeared, but where it has remained it is also written by a *y*, as, *kony*, “horse”

Roman character, no substitute for this mark and Dobrowsky also omits it at the end of words. Etymologically however this *yerr* always represents a suppressed mute vowel only not always an *o* nor as Grimm conjectures (in his valuable Preface to Wuk's Slavian Grammar p. xxxiv) a *u*. Rather each of the three short fundamental vowels—*a* (as represented also by *o* *e*) *i* *u* (for which may stand *y*, *o*),—is very frequently dropped at the end of words and although the *i* is seldom entirely suppressed more generally throwing back its sound as *y* nevertheless the vowel suppressed after the *m* of *rabo m per serium* and in Russian replaced by *yerr* is clearly, as we gather from the Lithuanian an *i*.

(l)—I\* believe I may assert that in the whole extent of the structure of the Slavonic language at least in all the conditions of its noun and verb not a single final consonant occurs after which some termination which through the cognate languages can be pointed out as beginning with a vowel has not been dropped. Thus the base *Nebes* *cælum* forms in the genitive plural likewise *nebes*, but the vanished termination is in Sanskrit *आम्* *ām* (नभसाम *nabhasām* *cælorum*) Greek *ων* (*veph(e)σων*) Latin *um* Gothic *e*. The real final consonants however which in the truly preserved elder dialects of the Indo European family stand as the foundation of the word have utterly disappeared in Slavonic polysyllables *e* *g* from *आस्* *as* *ēs* is formed, in the nominative plural *e* (*e*) and *synov ē* answers to forms like *सूनवस्* *sunav as* *βορπυ* *es*.

(m)—As far as regards the writing of those consonants which in the Slavonic alphabet properly correspond to the Roman we express the sound of the French *j* (*zivyele* in the Carmolan *sh*) as in Zend (§ 65) by *sch* that of our German *sch* (= *च*) by *sh* as in Sanskrit

\* Cf § 783 Remark.



and also as, in Sanskrit, the *tsch* by *ch*: for the sound of the Greek ζ (=ds) we retain ζ, and use *z* for the sound of our German *z* (=ls) for *χ* we write *ch*. In regard to etymology, it is important to call attention to the relation of this letter to sibilants, by means of which *snocha*, "daughter-in-law," corresponds to the Sanskrit स्नुषा *snushā*. *Ch* also, in declension and conjugation before certain vowels, passes into *s*

[G Ed. p 340] (Dobr. pp 39, 41), and in some cases into *sh* (Dobr 41). Finally, in preterites like *dach*, "I gave," *dachom*, "we gave," the *ch* returns to the *s* (स् *s*, Σ) whence it has proceeded, in the cases where a personal ending beginning with a *t* follows it, hence, *daste*, "ye gave," *dasta*, "ye two" and "they two gave."† As the vowels exercise a multifarious influence in the transformation of gutturals preceding them, we will further remark that the *ch* under discussion maintains itself in the 3d person plural before *û*, but before *a* appears as *sh*, hence, *dasha* or *dachû*, "they gave"

(n)—[For the semi-vowel *y* (य *y*) the Cyrillian alphabet gives the Greek ι, excepting in the cases for which the inventor of the character has provided by particular letters set together according to their value, which, at the same time, express the *y* with the following vowel, that is to say, *ya* is never written by two letters. It would, however, for this reason, be wrong to assume a vowel *ya*, as this syllable, however it may be written, still always unites in itself two sounds. For *ye*, also,

\* Dobrowsky has, however, as *t* appears to me, not perceived the irrefragable connection between the *ch* of *dach* and the *s* of *daste*, for he considers the *ch* and *ste*, &c as personal terminations (pp 264 383, 397), and hence he nowhere informs us that *ch* before *t* passes into *s*. More on this subject when we come to the verb

† The vowels mentioned here, preceded by *y*, are, with the exception of *ye* and *yû*, nasalised vowels (see § 783 Remark), and hence *pyaty*, "five," must be pronounced *panty* (in the original character ПЯТЬ)

Cyril has provided by a simple sign and *yl* is expressed by an *n* in conjunction with an *e*. But *y* often appears in Slavonic as a dialectic addition before vowels foreign to the cognate languages. Compare *yesmy* 'I am' *yam* (for *yadmy*) 'I eat' *pyaty* 'five' *desyaty*, 'ten' *yedin* 'one' with the corresponding Sanskrit forms *asmī* *admi* *pañcan* *daśan* *adī* (*primus*). An *o* which follows is in accordance with similar forms which we have observed in the Zend and Lithuanian (§ 137 and p 174 Note\*), changed into *e* through the influence of a *y* preceding it. In like manner in accordance with the Zend and Lithuanian the *y* after it has assimilated a vowel following it has often itself disappeared and has left behind only its effect and thereby the proof of its former existence \*

\* Dobrowsky does not express himself with sufficient clearness regarding this form when he says (cap II § III) that *o* after *y* and liquid consonants is changed into *e*. According to this, one would believe that besides *y* certain other consonants had the power of changing an *o* following them into *e*. Dobrowsky understands—which however as far as I know, he nowhere expressly says—under *consonæ liquidæ*, those which in consequence of a following *yer* (*y*) have retained a more flowing and softer pronunciation while he calls the consonants without *yer* *consonæ solidæ* (comp I c p 267) so that no consonant is by nature and of itself alone liquid but receives this quality through a following *yer* (a *y* without a vowel). Thus in Dobrowsky's second masculine declension, the consonants *r* *ch*, and *z* in *-ary*, 'kin' *vrachy*, 'physician' and *knyazhy* 'prince' are liquid. But as these words in the instrumental form *zarem* *brachem* *knyazhem*, Dobrowsky ascribes the *e* for *o* to the influence of a liquid consonant while according to my opinion the consonants in these forms have no concern whatever in transforming *o* into *e* but for *-arem* &c *-aryem* must originally have stood. And as in this form the *y* is the full semi vowel not entirely without a vowel sound and therefore not the expression of the *yer* without a vowel which softens the consonant preceding it—as in the abbreviated nominative *zary*—so the *r* also in *-aryem*, was not liquid and has not according to my opinion become liquid after the dropping of the semi vowel, at least I find it nowhere stated

[G Ed. p 341] 256. We must now, in order to be able to compare the true case-suffixes of the Old Slavonic with those of the cognate languages, first of all endeavour to ascertain the final letter of the kinds of base which occur, as they have for the most part been rubbed off in the singular nominative, whence it has appeared as if these letters, where they again present themselves in the oblique cases, either belonged to the case termination, or were an addition equally foreign to the base and to the termination, which has been termed "augment" by Dobrowsky. After becoming

[G Ed p 342] acquainted with the true base, the case terminations assume, in many points, an entirely different shape from what Dobrowsky has represented (p 160), with whom we cannot concede to the neuter a nominative termination *o* or *e*, but perhaps the advantage of having preserved, in preference to the masculine, the final vowel of the theme in this case. For the practical use of the language, and to keep simply within the limits of the Slavonic language, all might, notwithstanding, be assumed as inflexion which is usually represented as such. It is not, however, here our object to consider those syllables as supplying the place of grammatical relations which present themselves to the feeling of the speaker as such, but only those which may be so traced through the history of the language, and which, for thousands of years, have subsisted as Grammatical forms.

257. To the masculine and neuter bases in *a* correspond, in the Old Slavonic as well as in Greek, bases in *o*, which vowel has disappeared in the nominative and

stated that the *r* and other consonants, in forms like *zarem*, *knyažem*, *golūbem*, *lebedem*, are differently pronounced from what they are in *prom*, *vožom*, *lobom*, *adom*, of Dobrowsky's first masc declension. The difference in the two classes of words is only this, that the former have a *y* for the last letter but one of their theme, which, by the power of assimilation, has changed the following *o* into *e*, which *e*, after the *y* has been dropped, does not again become *o*.

\* Dialectically the older *a* has, in certain cases, maintained itself, as in

accusative singular so the corresponding *a* has disappeared in Gothic except in the neuter (as Gothic *blinda ta cœcum* in contrast with *blind s cœcus*) it has also maintained itself frequently in the beginning of compounds in the Gothic and Old Greek where according to the oldest principle the naked theme is required, as *nov novus* appears in many compounds as *noio* (*noio-grad* new town) but is then not to be considered as the neuter *noio novum* but as the common theme [G Ed p 343] of the masculine and neuter, in which as yet no difference of sex is pointed out The clearest proof that the class of nouns under discussion corresponds to the Indian Lithuanian and Gothic nouns in *a* is afforded by their feminine bases in *a* (for *ai d*), so that to the form *rab* (for *rabo*) servant corresponds a feminine *raba* a maid that is to say all Old Slavonic primitive adjectives i.e. those with an indefinite declension correspond to the Sanskrit in *a s a*, *a m* Greek *ος η(α) οι* Latin *us a um* much as one might be led astray by outward appearance to seek in the adjectives which in the nominative masculine end in *y* (*yer*), and in the neuter in *e* as *sinj*, *cœruleus s.jne*, *cœrulum*, an analogy to Latin adjectives like *mili s mile*

258 But I recognise in adjectives like that just mentioned and in similarly constituted substantives as *knyažy* prince *more* the sea bases of such a nature as without the euphonic form mentioned at § 255 (*n*), must have terminated in *yo* whence *ye* and hence, in the nominative masculine—according to the suppression of the final vowel of the base *y* in this case—and in the neuter *e* retaining the vowel and dropping the *y* These bases therefore correspond to the Indian in *y ya* the Greek and Latin in

the Carniolan before all inflections beginning with *m* in the three numbers as *posla m* through the domestic *posla ma* the two domestics This word appears to be identical with पुत्र *putra* son Persian *pisar* son, 'boy young man and to owe its meaning to familiar address

io, *iu* (ǣγio-s, ǣγio-v, *sociu-s*, *præliu-m*), that is to say, *serdze* (nominative and accusative neuter), "heart," corresponds to the Sanskrit हृदयम् *hṛdaya-m*, which is likewise neuter. The feminines, again, afford a practical proof of the justice of this theory, for the Slavonic bases in *ya* correspond to the Sanskrit feminine bases in य *yā* Greek α, Latin *a*), and this form, in the uninflected nominative, stands opposed to the masculine termination *y* and neuter *e*, as *sin̄ya*, "cærulea," to *sin̄y*, "cæruleus," and *sine*, "cæruleum"

[G. Ed. p 344] When an *i* or other vowel precedes the last *y* but one of the base, the *y* in the nominative, and accusative masculine is changed into the vowel *ĩ*, as, *nyetĩ*, "nepos et sorore" (Dobrowsky, p 282) The corresponding feminine form is *rya*, and the neuter *ye*, the *y* of which has arisen from *i* of the form *rye*, which is to be supposed the original, after dropping the last *y* but one. To the Sanskrit सव्यस् *savya-s*, सव्या *savyā*, सव्यम् *savya-m* (*sinister, a, um*), correspond thus *sh̄ñi*, *sh̄ñya*, *sh̄ñe* (compare Dobrowsky, p. 285)

259 The Old Slavonic masculine and neuter bases in *yo*,\* with their feminines in *ya*, are, according to their origin, of four kinds 1 Those in which, as in *SHŪYO*=सव्य *savya*, both the semi-vowel and the vowel following, from the earliest period of the language, belong to the base of the word, and this case is perhaps the most rare. 2 Such as originally end in *i*, to which an unorganic *o* has been added; as, in the Lithuanian, the bases in *i*, in many cases, change into the declension in *ia* (*ie*) (§. 193. and p 174, Note<sup>4</sup>) To this class belongs *MORYO*, nom. *more*, "the sea," the *e* of which therefore differs widely from

\* Where I fix the theme, I leave the euphonic law contained in § 255 (*n*) unregarded, and I give *SERDZYO* as the theme of *serdze* ("heart," nom acc), although the latter is no other than the theme modified according to that euphonic law, *i e* without inflection, as in the Sanskrit *vāch* is laid down as the theme, although *ch* cannot stand at the end of a word, but passes into *h*, as in the nominative *vāk*, which is properly identical with the theme

the *mare* in Latin corrupted from *mari* so that the Slavonic *y* which again makes its appearance in the genitive *morya* dative *moryŭ* corresponds to the Latin *e* spoken of. The Latin word must however in order to be classed with the Slavonic be pronounced in the nominative *maria m*. Neuter bases in *i* without an unorganic augment are entirely wanting in the Slavonic [G Ed p 345]

Among the masculines of this class of words *cherny*, a worm (theme *CHERVŬO*), answers to the Sanskrit कर्म *krmi* and the Latin *VERMI* Old High German *WURMI*, and *ŷyaly* (ŷYATYO) *gener* to the Sanskrit जाति *jati* feminine *familia* *genus* from जन् *jan* to be born\*. The third kind of bases in *yo* is that where the unorganic *y* precedes a final *o* according to the euphonic disposition mentioned in § 255 (n). So *gusy* (GŪSYO) corresponds to the Indian हंस *hansa* goose (§ 255 g). In the fourth place there exist among bases in *yo* the words in which the *y* as well as the following vowel is an unorganic addition. Thus nouns of agency in *TARYO* correspond to the Sanskrit in तर् *tar* (तृ *tri* in the strong cases तर् *tār*) to the Latin in *tor*, and to the Greek in τῆρ *τῶρ* hence the nominatives *my tary schi tary* and *ŷlatary* (Dobrowsky p 295) and with *y* for *a* *pas lyry*, shepherd. Of this kind also are the nouns of agency in *TEIŬO* the *l* of which is clearly an interchange with *r* (§ 20) so that this suffix also conforms itself to the Sanskrit तर् *tar* hence the nominatives *blago dyetely*, *beneficus*, *pye tely* a cock from the root *pye* 'to siag' *schately* 'messor' *spas i tely*, 'salvator †

\* *ŷ* frequently answers to the Sanskrit ज् *j* and for example ज्ञा *jna* to know is in the Slavonic *ŷna* (infinitive *ŷnati*)

† But see p 879 Note § 647

‡ As these words stand in analogy with the infinitive in *ti* in so far that their suffix begins with a like consonant, Dobrowsky (pp 292 293) derives them from the infinitive and allows them simply *el* as suffix (as also simple *ary* for *ta y*) as it has been the custom to derive also in the Latin, *tor* and *turns* from the supine. However it is certain the

260 To the Sanskrit feminine bases in ऋ *ā* correspond as has been already remarked, Old Slavonic in *a*. To

[G. Ed p 346] this class of words, however, belong also some masculines, particularly proper names, which are then declined entirely as feminines, as in Latin *nauta, calicula*, &c. (§ 116.), on which we will not here dwell further. Among the bases in *i* there are, in Old Slavonic, no neuters, and only a very small number of masculines as in Lithuanian—which Dobrowsky, p 469, represents as anomalous, as though they were only irregulars of his second declension masculine they are, however, in reality, foreign to it, for this very reason, that they end their theme with *i*, but the former with *yo*, and in part with *yy*, (§. 263). It is only in the nominative and accusative singular that these three classes of words, from various reasons, agree, and, *gosty*, “guest,” from *GOSTI* (Gothic *GASTI*, Latin *HOSTI*) agrees with *knyazы*, “prince,” from *KNYAZYO*, and *vrachy*, “medicus,” from *VRACHYY*. The masculine bases originally ending with *n* there are but a few of them—form most of their cases from a base augmented by *i*, *KAMEN*, “stone” (Sanskrit ऋश्मन् *asman*), is extended to *KAMENI*, and then follows *GOSTI*.

261 To the Sanskrit feminine bases in ऋ *i* correspond numerous Old Slavonic bases of a similar termination (Dobrowsky, decl. fem. iv.), that is to say, the Slavonic agrees with the Sanskrit in the formation of feminine ab-

the suffixes *TOR*, *TURU* and the Slavonic *TARYO*, *TELFO*, used to borrow then *t* not at first from another syllable of formation so commencing. They form primitive words from the roots themselves, and not derivatives from other words.

\* Thus, also, *PŪTI*, “a way” (Sanskrit पथिन् *pathin*), and *LYŪDI*, pl. *num*, nom *lyúdy-e*, “people,” Gothic *LAUDI*, nom *lauths*, “a person,” the *au* of which, according to § 255 (*f*), is represented by *ū* (*g*), and, according to § 255. (*m*), has gained a prefixed *y*. *GOSPODI*, “a master” (comp पति *pati*, Lithuan *PATI* and Gothic *FADI*) is in fact irregular, as it passes into several kinds of theme in its declension.

stricts in *TI*, as *PA MYA TI* memory nom *pamyaty* from the root *MAN*, as in Sanskrit मति *mati* (for *mantī*) spirit" meaning from मन् *man* to think \* (compare *memini*) These words weaken, indeed, in [G Ld p 347] the nominative and accusative their *i* to *yer* but in no case overstep their original base by an unorganic addition and hence they must not on any account, be looked upon as of the same base with the majority of masculines terminating similarly in the nominative and accusative singular But Dobrowsky's third feminine declension is of a mixed nature (*zerkovy* a church) in this we recognise some words which have by Guna changed a Sanskrit final ऊ *u* to *ov*, and from this form several cases as from a base ending with a consonant—e g *zerkvo-c* genitive singular and nominative plural—but so that the *o* is suppressed before vowel terminations In some cases the theme extends itself by an unorganic *i* in others by *a* and also before these extensions of the base the *o* of the syllable *ov* is suppressed† e g *zerkuy u* per ecclesiam *zerl u*, ecclesia *zerkvī* ecclesiarum *zerl i a m* ecclesius, *zerkva ch* in ecclesius *zerk i a m i* per ecclesias The dative locative *zerk u* is doubtful as this case could have no other sound than *zerk u* whether it come from *ZERKOV* or from *ZERKVI*

\* Dobrowsky (p 350) imputes in my opinion wrongly the *n* of *po mjanu*, I remember and some similar bases to derivation instead of supposing that the radical *n* is suppressed before *i* in analogy with the Sanskrit, and as in Greek τ οis from ΤΑΝ Sanskrit तन्ति *tanti-s\** a line (as extended) for तन्ति *tanti s*

† The example given by Dobrowsky *zerkovy* a church nevertheless does not apply to monosyllables as *kravy* blood (Sanskrit कृष्य *kravya* neuter 'flesh'), nor to those polysyllables in which two consonants precede the syllable *ov* for *yatriach* and *tr i ch* would be equally impracticable (comp Gretsck by Reiff p 163) *Brov*, eyebrow also appears to form all its cases from a theme *BROVI* an extension of the Sanskrit ब्रु *brū* feminine by the addition of *i* with a Guna of the ऊ *u* The nominative plural is hence *brovi* (Dobrowsky p 110) not *brov c*.



Some words of this class have, in the nominative, *y*, and [G Ed p 348] thus *svekry* agrees with  $\text{स्वयं}$  *śwaśrū-s*, "socrus" (§ 255 c.), others have, at will, *ovy* or *vi*, with *o* suppressed, hence *zerkovy* or *zerkvi*.

262. Among bases in *u* (Greek *υ*) of the cognate languages, only masculines have maintained themselves in the Old Slavonic. They, like the bases in *o*, suppress their final vowel in the nominative and accusative, but in the remaining cases this letter shews itself either with Guna changed to *ov* or *û* (§. 255. f.), or without Guna, as *o* (§ 255. c.), and in the latter form it appears also in the beginning of compound words as a naked theme. Hence it is more probable, that anciently for *syn*, "*filus*," "*filum*," stood *syno* rather than *syny* (§. 255 c.).<sup>\*</sup> With this similar conformation of theme of the old bases in *a* and *u*, it is not surprising that two kinds of bases, which in their origin are widely different, run very much into one another in the Slavonic declension, and that, in the more modern dialects, these two declensions, which were originally so strictly separate, have fallen almost entirely into one.

263 As in the *o* bases which have arisen from  $\text{अ}$  *a*, a *y* preceding introduces a difference of declension, which we, in § 258, have represented as purely euphonic, the same phenomenon makes its appearance also in the *y* bases, by means of which their Guna form is articulated *ev* (for *yev*) instead

\* We term this class of words, nevertheless, bases in *y*, for although their final letter never occurs as *y*, still, according to § 225 (c), *y* is the most legitimate, even if it be the most rare, representative of the Sanskrit  $\text{उ}$  *u*. But should it be wished to call them bases in *v*, they would not be distinguished from the order of words, which, according to § 257, bear this name with more right. The term *u* bases would be appropriate only so far as here, under the *u*, might be understood, not the Old Slavonic  $\text{у}$  (etymologically =  $\text{ओ}$  *ô*), but the Sanskrit  $\text{उ}$  *u* or the Latin *u* of the fourth declension, which, in the Old Slavonic, has no real existence

of *ov* \* If however with Dobrowsky we di- [G Ed p 349]  
 vide the Old Slavonic masculines—with the exception of the  
 bases in *z* § 260—into two declensions and in doing this de-  
 sire as is natural to ground the division on the final letters of  
 the bases we must place *knjazŷy* prince (nominative) of  
 Dobrowsky's second declension in the first and by the side  
 of *rab* a servant on the other hand the words *syn*  
*son* and *dom* a house of Dobrowsky's first masculine  
 declension must be transferred to the second declension  
 as mutilated *y* forms Of the paradigm here given by  
 Dobrowsky *vrachŷy* 'medicus' adheres most strictly to the  
 true *y* declension and according to § 250 (n) opposes  
*ev* to the *ov* of *SlNI* On the other hand words inflected  
 like *zary* a king (nominative) clearly form the nomi-  
 native and genitive plural from bases in *z*, hence *zarye*  
 kings *zarŷi*, of kings from *ZARI* as *gostŷy e* ho-  
 spites" and *gostŷi hospitum* from *GOSTI* In the dative  
 plural and instrumental singular the form *-are m* is doubt-  
 ful in this and other words also of obscure origin it re-  
 mains uncertain whether the more contracted theme in *z*  
 or the more extended in *yy* is the older, but it is certain  
 that several old *z* bases have migrated into this declension  
 by an unorganic addition for instance *ogny* fire (nom)  
 dative *ognev-z* from *OGNŷY* *Y* agrees with the Sanskrit अग्नि  
*agni* Latin *IGNI* Lithuanian *UGNI*† It [G Ed p 350]

\* Without Guna the final of the base is pronounced *e* for *ye* from *yo*  
 (§ 255 n) and hence in the cases without Guna the *yy* bases are just  
 as little to be distinguished in their inflection from the *yo* bases as, in  
 the instrumental singular *syno-m* (from the theme *SlNI*) from *rabo-m*  
 (theme *RABO*) In the beginning of compound words, also the *yy* bases  
 end like those in *yo* with *e* for *ye*

† As regards words inflected like *mravŷi*, the only proof which could  
 bring them under the head of the *y* bases is the vocative sing *mrav ju*  
 that they however, although they have borrowed this case from the *y*  
 declension, originally belong to the *o* declension is proved by their  
 feminine in *z/ya* and neuter in *z/ye* or *y* (Dobrowsky p 282)



heaven, Sanskrit नभस् *nabhas*. In the [G Ed p 301] nonnominative accusative and vocative they relinquish the concluding *s* (according to § 255 1) and afterwards strengthen the *e* to *o* (§ 255 a). We cannot therefore any longer compare the *o* of *nebo* with the Sanskrit Zendian *o* which has arisen out of *a + u*. As in this abbreviation of *es* to *o* the neuter *es* bases in the cases mentioned become similar to the *o* bases it is then—on account of the influence of these cases and because the nominative principally gives the tone in the declension and shews in the oblique cases an inflection that which is in itself deficient—it is then we say not surprising if the original *o* bases at times admit an *es* in the oblique cases particularly when we consider the original great extension of these neuter bases terminating in *s* (compare § 241) which induces the conjecture that many words now declined as *o* bases were originally domiciled in the bases in *es*. On the other hand Dobrowsky proves that there is no admixture of *es* in the thoroughly legitimate adjective *o* bases. It is also clear from § 205 (1) that the bases in *yat*\* in the uninflected cases must lay aside the *i* and follow *σῶμα* not महन् *mahat* (*magnum*) and *caput*.

265 Of the class of words in *r* mentioned in § 144 two feminine words have remained in the Old Slavonic which derive most of their cases from the genuine *r* bases but in others increase the original base by an unorganic *i* or also by *ya* (compare the Lithuanian in § 111) in the nominative singular however in accordance with the Sanskrit and Lithuanian they suppress the *r*. These are *mati* mother and *dsheht* daughter, in the latter only occurs the increase of the base by *ya* (in the nominative accusative and dative plural) the declension of the former springs [G Ed p 307]

\* They are all derivatives from names of animals, and denote the young of the animal mentioned

partly from *MATER*, *c. g.* *mater-e*, "*matris*," and *matres* (*μαῖρέρ-ες*), partly from *MATERI*, *c. g.* *matery*, "*matrem*."

266 "In order now to pass over to the formation of cases, the nominative and accusative have lost the case-signs *s* and *m*, with the exception of the bases in *a*, which present in the diphthong *û* (*u*), a contraction of the vocalized nasal with the final vowel of the base shortened to *o*, (see §. 255. *g.*), hence *vodû*, "*aquam*," from *vodo-û*. The instrumental has, in the feminine, and the pronouns which have no gender preserved the genuine Sanskrit inflection, but it is to be remarked of the feminine bases in *i* that they change this vowel before the termination *û*, (for *û*, see §. 255 *h.*), not into simple *y*, but into *iy*, so that in this respect the Old Slavonic agrees more closely with the Pâli, which, in the corresponding class of words, changes the final *i* before all the vowel endings into *iy*, than with the Sanskrit. Hence, let *kostiy-û*, from *KOSTI*, "*bones*," be compared with the Pâli *पितृय-û* (*pîtīy-û* from *pîti*, "*joy*"), for the Sanskrit *पितृय-û*. Masculines and neuters have *m†* for their instrumental ending, and this is, I have no doubt, an abbreviation of the Lithuanian *mi*, and comes therefore from *bi* (§. 215).

267 The dative has, in the singular, a common ending with the locative, and, in fact, the Old Sanskrit *i* (§. 195.), hence, *imen-i*, "*in nomine*," and "*nomini*," *synov-i*, "*filio*," *brachev-i*, "*medico*," from *SYNY* and *BRACHYY* (§. 263.), with Guna †. If the case-sign is suppressed, the preceding *ov* [G. Ed p 353] becomes *û*, and *ev* (from *yov*) becomes *yû*, hence, also, *synû*, "*filio*," with *synov-i*, and *zaryû*, "*regi*," with

+ Cf § 783<sup>1</sup>

† For *m*, according to Dobrowsky, we should read *mb my*.

‡ Hence I am now disposed, contrary to § 177, to assume for the Lithuanian a common origin for the two cases, although in their received condition they are externally separated from one another, as is the case in Old Slavonic, also, in several classes of words

the *y* bases but prefer however the abbreviated form *ŭ* hence *robŭ* from *RABO* more rarely *rabou* : The *o* bases of the adjectives, and of these there are in the masculine and neuter only *o* bases, and those of neuter substantives have alone the uninflected form in *ŭ* hence *e g* *blagŭ bono* masc neut. *sinjŭ caruleo* masc neut *slouŭ verbo* *moryŭ mari* not *blagov-i sinev-i slouov-i morci* : In masculine names of inanimate things this uninflected form in *ŭ* extends itself also to the genitive and locative hence *domŭ*, of the house to and in the house but in the dative is also found *domou* : and in the locative *domye* \* The pronouns of the 3d person masculine and neuter—with exception of the reflexive—have in the dative in like manner the uninflected *ŭ* for the form *mŭ* in *to mŭ* to this, is clearly from the Sanskrit appended pronoun *स्मा sma* (§ 165 &c.) which has extended itself in the cognate European languages so much and under such different forms, and thus in the Old Slavonic, would necessarily give the base *SMO* from which after dropping the *s*, would come the dative *mŭ* as *robŭ* from *RABO*

268 While the *o* bases as has been shown above, have borrowed their dative from the *y* declension the *y* bases appear in the locative to have intruded on the *o* class for *synye* answers to *robye* from *RABO* from *RABA* (§ 255 a) but the *ye* of *robye* is according to § 255 (c) clearly from the Sanskrit *य* of *ये, vilka* from *वृक्ष vilka* and answers to the Lithuanian *vilke* from [G Ed p 34] *WILKA* (§ 197) As however in Lithuanian, from *SUNU* comes *sunu ye* so may also the Old Slavonic *synye* require

\* Masculine names of inanimate things all follow the declension of *dom* (theme *DO MI*) although very few among them according to their origin fall into the class of the old *उ u i e* of the Latin fourth declension but for the most part correspond to Sanskrit bases in *य a*



to be divided into *syn'-ye* : and this is rendered the more probable, as the feminine *a* bases, also, have in the locative *ye* for *a-ye* ; hence *vod'-ye*, “in aqua,” from *VODA*, answers to the Lithuanian *rañko-ye* (for *ranka-ye*) from *ranka*.\* In bases in *z*, masculine and feminine, it might appear doubtful whether *z*, with which they end in the dative and locative *e g.* *pâtz*, “in the way,” *kostz*, “in the bone” is to be ascribed to the theme or to the inflection as, however, in the genitive, (to which belongs an *z*, though not through any inflection), they have just the same sound, and otherwise never entirely give up the *z* of the base, except in the instrumental plural, it is more natural to consider the forms *pâtz*, *kostz*, uninflected, just like *domû*, “in the house.” We may also look upon the *z* in the dative and locative of those bases, which have *y* as the last letter but one, as nothing else than the vocalization of this *y*, the *i*, therefore, of *knyažz*, *mori*, *brachz*, *volz*, represents nothing else than the *y* of the masculine bases *KNYAŽYO*, *VRACHYY*, and of the neuter *MORYO*, and feminine *VOLYO*.

269. In the genitive the terminations *as*, *os*, *zs*, which, in the cognate languages, are joined to bases ending with a consonant, must, according to §. 255. (*l*), drop the *s*, but the [G Ed p 355] vowel appears as *e* in all the bases ending with a consonant (§§. 260 264) hence *imen-e*, “of the name,”

\* It must be allowed that here occurs the very weighty objection, that the feminine form *rankoye* in the Lithuanian, and *vodye* in the Slavonic, might stand in connection with the Sanskrit *आयाम्* *âyām* in *जिह्वायाम्* *gñhu ây-âm* (§ 202) ; so that, after dropping the *m*, as in the Zend (§ 202), the preceding vowel, which in the Zend is already short, would, through the euphonic influence of the *y*, become *e*. As the bases in *z* in the Lithuanian, down to a few exceptions, are feminine, so might also *arvyz* from *arvz-s*, “a sheep,” be divided into *arvyz-e*, and compared with *मत्याम्* *maty-âm*, from *matz* or *भित्याम्* *bhity-âm* from *bhî* (comp in § 266 *kosty-û*, for *kosty-û*, from *KOSTI*)

answers to  $\text{नमनस}$  *nāmn as namin is*, *nebus-e* of the heaven to  $\text{नभसस्}$  *nabhas as nebhe(σ)-os* *maler e* to *malis*  $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma$  *malis*. The pronominal forms also follow this analogy *men e*, “*mei*,” *teb e* *tui seb e*, *sui* because in the oblique singular cases *MEN TLB SEB* are their themes. We recognise the fuller Sanskrit genitive ending  $\text{स्य}$  *sya* in the pronominal genitive termination *go ns to go* =  $\text{तस्य}$  *ta sya* (§ 188). This comparison might alone be sufficient in place of all proof but over and above is to be remarked the easily adopted hardening of the semi vowel *y* to *g* (comp p 121 G ed) and in the Prakrit to  $\text{ꣳꣳ}$  (§ 19), finally let the high degree of improbability be considered that the Slavonic should have formed an entirely new genitive termination, foreign to all the cognate languages. Now, if the *g* of the termination *go* is taken for a hardening from *y* ( $\text{ꣳꣳ}$  *y*) then the Old Slavonic has preserved exactly as much as the Greek of the termination *sya* and *go* answers to the Greek *io* and *to-go*, *huyus* to the Greek *to-to*. As however, in Slavonic the sibilants are easily interchanged with gutturals (see § 255 *m*) one might also conjecture the *g* of *go* to be a corruption of the Sanskrit  $\text{स}$  and the semi vowel of  $\text{स्य}$  *sya* which had been lost. This conjecture cannot entirely be put aside, but in any case even in this supposition the termination *go* remains connected with  $\text{स्य}$  *sya* and *io*. As however in the Old Slavonic *g* is else where exchanged only with  $\zeta$  and *sch* (Dobr p 11) but not with *s* in my opinion the derivation of *g* from *y* ( $\text{ꣳꣳ}$  *y*) is to be preferred to that from *s*.

270 The substantive and adjective (indefinite) *o* bases in disadvantageous comparison with the pronouns which hold fast the old form have lost the genitive termination *go* but for it in compensation for the lost termi [G Ed p 308] nation they have retained the old *a* of the base instead of according to § 255 (*a*) weakening it to *o*, hence *raba serui noua* (= Sanskrit *nata sya*) *noua*. Now, although the *y* bases





*knjažyc* Bases in *yy* change their *y* by Guna to *û* (§ 255 *f*) in analogy with § 205 hence *vrachyû*—more commonly with *y* suppressed *vrachû*—*medice!* from *VRACHYŸ* On the other hand *y* bases without *y* for their penultimate letter commonly omit the Guna and weaken their final vowel like the *o* bases to *e* hence *syni* oh son! more rarely *synû* (Dobr p 470), = Gothic *sunau* Lithuanian *sunau* Sanskrit *sunô* from *sunau*

## DUAL

273 By preserving *n* dual the Old Slavonic surpasses the Gothic in which this number is lost in the noun it exceeds in the same the Lithuanian in the more true retention of the terminations and it is richer than the Greek by one case The agreement with the Sanskrit and Zend is not to be mistaken let the comparison be made

		SANSKRIT	ZEND	OLD SLAVONIC
N	Acc. V	m ubhâ (ambo Vedic)	ubâ	oba
	f n	ubhê,	ubê	obyê (§ 250 n)
I D	Ab m f n	ubhâ-bhydâm	ubâi bya	I D obyê ma (§ 215)*
G	L m f n	ubhay-âs	ubây â	oboy â †

\* The *ye* which precedes the termination *ma* may be compared with the Sanskrit *ê* in plural forms as युक्तेभ्यः *riktebhya* *ye ma*, however occurs in the Old Slavonic only in *dyê ma* 'duobu. per duos' and some pronouns The usual form of substantive *o* bases before this ending is that with an unchanged *o*, as *sto ma* from *sto* a hundred and the final *a* of feminine substantives also remains unchanged as *dyetâ ma* from *DĒVA*, a girl

† The form *â* for the Sanskrit ending *âs*, is according to § 200 (*f*) and (*l*), necessary the Zend certainly approaches the Old Slavonic in casting away the *s* voluntarily The *oy* which precedes the termination *u*, clearly corresponds to the Sanskrit *ay* (see § 200) and the

Zend

[G Ed p 358] The Sanskrit *ubhê*, as neuter, comes, according to § 212, from the theme *ubha*, in union with the case-suffix *î*, and the feminine *ubhê* is an abbreviation of *ubhay-âu*, and is therefore without a case termination (§. 212) The Old Slavonic, which runs parallel to the Sanskrit in both genders, and, according to § 255 (*l*), opposes *ye* to the Indian 'रê, no longer recognises the origin of this *ye*, and regards it entirely as a case-suffix before which the final vowel of the theme appears to be suppressed Therefore, also, neuter bases ending in a consonant make *ye* their termination, if the *imenye*, "two names," given by Dobrowsky, p 513, actually occurs, and is not a theoretic formation. In feminines, however, the termination *ye* extends, exactly as in Sanskrit, only to bases in *a* (for Sanskrit *â*, §. 255 *a*), but in such a manner, that those with *y* as the last letter but one in the theme reject the termination *ye*, and vocalize the *y* of the theme, hence *dyerye*, "two guls," from *dyeva*, but *steži*, "two steps," from *STEŽYA*. The feminine bases in *z*, in the dual case under discussion, answer to the Sanskrit and Lithuanian forms mentioned at §§. 210 211., as *patî*, "two sons," from पति *patî*, .

[G Ed p 359] *avê*, "two sheep," from *AVI*, only that, according to § 255. *b*), the *z* in the Slavonic is not lengthened, as *dlanî* from *DLANI* (nominative singular

Zend *ôy* or *ay* (see p 277), but that occurs only in *dvoy-û*=Sanskrit *duvay-ôs*, "of two," "in two" m f n, and in *toy-û*=Sanskrit *tay-ôs*, "of these two," m f n The genitives and locatives of the two first persons also rest on this principle, only retaining the older *a*—*nayû*, *vânû* For the rest, however, the final vowel of the theme is rejected before the termination *û*, as *st'-û* (Sanskrit *shatay-ôs*) from *STO*, "a hundred," *dyev-û* from *DYEVA*, "a girl", and thus occurs, also, together with *dvoyû*, the syncopated form *dvû* Although the Lithuanian generally does not drop the final *s*, still the *û* mentioned in § 225 may be identical with the Slavonic *û*, as in the Zend, also, in this termination the *s* is often dropped

*dluny) vola manus* On the other hand the masculine *y* bases do not follow this principle but suppress the final vowel before the case suffix *a*, hence *syn n* two sons from *SYNY*

### PLURAL.

271 In the plural, the masculine nominative termination *e* (*c*) for the most part answers to the Greek *es*, and according to a universal rule of sounds omits the *s* (§ 215 1) hence *synoi e* the sons *мѣны sinav as* compare *βου-ες lamene* the stones for *κῆρυ-ες asmdn-as* (§ 21) compare *δαίμον-ες gosty e* guests" (theme *GOSFI*) for the Gothic *gastei s* and Greek forms like *ποσι es* The bases in *o* take as in Lithuanian do the corresponding bases in *a* : as their termination (see § 229) but before this reject the *o* of the base, hence *rab i* servants for *rabu i* (comp *λυκο-ι*) as in Latin *lup i* for *lupo i* Neuters have *a* for their ending like the cognate dialects with the exception of the Sanskrit with *i* for *a* nevertheless *slava ierbu* from *SLOVO*—as *δῶρα* from *ΔΩΡΟ*—answers to Vedic forms like *iand* woods from *vana* and the same thing obtains which § 231 p 267 G ed has been said of Gothic Greek and Latin regarding the relation of the *a* of the termination to the *o* of the theme As regards the bases ending in *n* consonant, let *imen a* names be compared with the Latin *nomina* and Gothic *namon a* *nebes a* the heavens, with *ιεφε(σ) α* and *ιelyal a* calves, with Greek forms like *σώματ α* Communes with the exception of the class of words in *ov* mentioned at § 261 have lost the nominative ending hence *volya voluntates* is the same as the theme and the nominative singular and [G Ed p 360] from *ΛΟΣΤΙ* bones" (Sanskrit *asthi* neuter) comes the nominative singular *kosly* and the plural like the theme.

275 The accusative plural is in feminine and neuter nouns the same as the nominative and therefore in the former

mostly without inflection, exactly as in the few masculine bases in *i*, hence *gosti* for the Gothic *gasti-n*s. Bases in *o*, without *y* preceding, like *RABO*, change this *o* into *y*, as *raby*, "*servos*", at least I cannot believe that this *y* is to be looked upon as the case-suffix; and I pronounce it to be the euphonic alteration of the *o* of the base, through the influence of the consonant of the inflection which has been dropped (comp. § 271) as in Lithuanian, also, the corresponding class of words often changes the final vowel (*o*) of the base into *u*, hence *wilkù-s*, "*lupos*," answering to the Gothic *vulfa-n*s and Sanskrit *mikhá-n*. But if the Old Slavonic bases in *y*, of animate creatures, form *owy* in the accusative plural, and thus *synowy*, "*filios*," answers to the Lithuanian *sunù-s* (from *SUNU*), this very Lithuanian form, as well as the Gothic and Sanskrit *sunu-n*s, सूनुन् *sínù-n*, prove that the Slavonic form is unorganic, and formed from an augmented theme *SYNOI O*, according to the analogy of *raby*. Bases in *yy* in this case follow bases in *yo* (from *ya*, §. 255. *a*), which, preserving the old *a* sound, give *ya*, as in the genitive singular (see § 270), hence *vrachya*, "*medicos*," like *knyačya*, "*principes*" but forms, also, like *doschdevy*, analogous with *synovy*, occur, following the euphonic rule, § 255. (*n*.)

276. The view here given is the more incontrovertible, as in the dative, also, *synovo-m*, "*filius*" (compare *rabo-m*), is clearly formed from a theme *SYNOTO*, increased by *o*, corresponding to the Lithuanian *sunu-ms*. This dative suffix *m*, for the Lithuanian *ms* (from *mus*, § 215.), according

[G Ed p 361] to § 255. (*l*), extends itself over all classes of words, and appears to be attached by a conjunctive vowel *e* to bases terminating with a consonant, but, in fact, it is to be considered that these, in the cases mentioned as also in the locative (see § 279), pass over into the *i* declension, as a final *i*, before the signs of case *m* and *ch*, becomes *e* and a similar metaplasm occurs in the Lithuanian, and indeed, to a

much greater extent (§ 125 *sub finem*, comp § 126) hence  
*imene m imene ch* from *IMENI* from *IMEN* names, as  
*koste m koste ch* from *KOSTI*, bones

277 Less general is the instrumental ending *m*, answering subject to the loss required by § 25 (1) to the Lithuanian *mis* Sanskrit *bhis* and Zend *bis*. This termination *m* is, however in masculine and neuter nouns for the most part lost (comp Dobr pp 473 and 477) and is preserved principally and indeed without exception in feminines as well as in a few masculine bases a final *z* of the base is however suppressed before the termination *m*. Let *kost m* be compared with अस्थिभिस् *asthi bhis* from अस्थि *asthi* 'bone' *vidoa m* with विधवाभिस् *vidhava bhis* from विधवा *vidhava* a widow. The instrumentals *raby* *synoy* are like the accusatives of similar sound uninflected (§ 275) the *z* of *knyažz vrachz* is the vocalization of the *y* of the bases *KYNAŽYO VRACHYY* after the loss of the final vowel, and the *y* of neuters terminating in a consonant, like *imeny per nomina* is to be explained by a transition into the *o* declension and is therefore analogous to *raby slavy* similarly to the *o* of the Greek dual forms like δαίμονιν (p 318 G ed Rem 2)

278 Dobrowsky (p 461) represents *ov y n r, en, yat* and *es* as plural genitive terminations but in reality the suffix of this case has entirely disappeared and in bases in *o* *u* and *y*, has also carried away those final vowels with it while bases in *z* double that vowel hence *rub* [G Ed p 362]

*servorum* from *RABO* *rod aquarum* from *LODA syn filiorum* from *SYNY* *kashu ossuum* from *KOSTI* *imen* 'nominum' from *IMEN* *nebes caelorum* from *NEBES*. The *n* and *s* of *imen, nebes* would without the former protection of *r* following termination have been dropped as in Slavonic we have only a second generation of final consonants while the former with the exception of a few monosyllabic forms has according to § 255 (1) disappeared

279. The termination of the locative plural is *ch* throughout all classes of words, and has been already, at § 255 (*m*) recognised as identical with the Indian सु *su*, and therefore, also, with the Greek σι· compare, also, the Zend 𐬕𐬀 *kha*, for the Sanskrit *sua*, in §. 35. Before this *kh*, *o* passes into *ye*, exactly as the corresponding Sanskrit अ *a* into ए *é* (see §. 255 *e*), hence *rabye-ch*, “in *servis*,” answers to वृक्षेषु *vríkṣe-shu*, “in *lupis*” Bases in *yo* and those in *yy* follow their analogy suppress, however, before this *ye*, their preceding *y*, as in similar cases, hence *knnyačye-ch*, “in *principibus*,” not *knnyačyy-ch* from KNYAČYO. A final *a* remains unchanged, hence *vdova-ch*, “in *viduis*,” answers to the Sanskrit *vidhavā-ṣu*. For bases in *i*, and consonants, see § 276

280. For an easier survey of the results obtained for the Old Slavonic case-formation, we give here, in order to bring under one point of view all the kinds of theme existing in Old Slavonic, and to render their comparison with one another easy, the complete declension of the bases RABO, m “a servant,” KNYAČYO, m. “a prince,” SLOVO, n “a word,” MORYO, n. “a sea” (Dobr. p 476, §. 11.), VODA, f. “water,” VOLYA, f “will,” GOSTI, m “a guest,” KOSTI, f “a bone,” SYNY, m “a son,” DOMY, m. “a house,” VRACHYY, m. “a physician,” KAMEN, m.

[G Ed p 363] “a stone,” IMEN, n “a name,” MATER, f. “a mother,” NEBES, n “heaven,” TELYAT, n. “a calf”\* In

\* The above examples are arranged according to their final letters, with the observation, however, that *o* represents an original short *a*, and hence precedes the *a* for Sanskrit *á* (§ 225 *a*). All bases in *t* have a *y* before the preceding *a*, this semi-vowel is, however, readily suppressed after sibilants, hence *ovcha* for *ovchya*, Dobr p 475, and hence, also, from *lzyo* come (nom *lze*) the genitive, dative, and nominative accusative plural *lza*, *lzá*, for *lzya*, *lzyú*. If in bases in *yo*, m n, and in feminines in *ya*, an *i* precedes the semi-vowel, this involves some apparent variations

those forms of the following table in which a part of the word is not separated from the rest thereby shewing itself to be the inflection we recognise no inflection at all i. e. no case-suffix but we see therein only the bare base of the word either complete or abbreviated, or also a modification of the base through the alteration of the final letter occasioned by the termination which has been dropped (compare § 271) In some cases which we present in the notes base and termination have however been contracted into one letter by which a division is rendered impossible With respect to the dual which cannot be proved to belong to all the words here given as specimens, we refer to § 273

variations in the declension which require no particular explanation here (cc. in *Dol r miruŭ* in p 469 *laduŭa* f p 148, and *uchenye* in p 474 With regard to *ary* a king see § 261)



[G Ed. p 364]

## SINGULAR.

THEME.	NOM.	ACCUS	INSTR.	DATIVI	GEN	LOC	VOC
<i>RABO</i> , m <sup>1</sup>	<i>rab'</i> ,	<i>rab'</i> ,	<i>rabo-my</i> ,	<i>rabŭ</i> , <sup>18</sup>	<i>raba</i> , <sup>21</sup>	<i>rabŭje</i> , <sup>25</sup>	<i>rabe</i>
<i>KNYAȚYO</i> m <sup>2</sup>	<i>knyaȥy'</i> ,	<i>knyaȥy'</i> ,	<i>knyaȥe-my</i> ,	<i>knyaȥŭjŭ</i> ,	<i>knyaȥya</i> , <sup>21</sup>	<i>knyaȥi</i> ,	<i>knyasche</i>
<i>SLOVO</i> , n <sup>3</sup>	<i>slovo</i> ,	<i>slovo</i> ,	<i>slovo-my</i> ,	<i>slovŭ</i> ,	<i>slova</i> , <sup>21</sup>	<i>slouvje</i> , <sup>25</sup>	
<i>MORYO</i> , n <sup>2</sup>	<i>more</i> ,	<i>more</i> ,	<i>more-my</i> ,	<i>moryŭ</i> ,	<i>morya</i> , <sup>21</sup>	<i>mori</i> ,	
<i>VODA</i> , f <sup>4</sup>	<i>voda</i> ,	<i>vodŭ</i> , <sup>15</sup>	<i>vodoy-ŭ</i> , <sup>16</sup>	<i>vod'-ŭje</i> , <sup>19</sup>	<i>vody</i> , <sup>22</sup>	<i>vod'-ŭje</i> , <sup>25</sup>	<i>vodo</i> .
<i>VOŁYA</i> , f <sup>4</sup>	<i>vołya</i> ,	<i>vołyŭ</i> , <sup>15</sup>	<i>vołciŭ-ŭ</i> , <sup>16</sup>	<i>vołi</i> ,	<i>vołŭja</i> ,	<i>vołi</i> ,	<i>vole</i>
<i>GOSTI</i> , m <sup>5</sup>	<i>gosty</i> ,	<i>gosty</i> ,	<i>goste-my</i> , <sup>17</sup>	<i>gosti</i> , <sup>20</sup>	<i>gosti</i> ,	<i>gosti</i> , <sup>20</sup>	<i>gosti</i> ?
<i>KOSTI</i> , f <sup>5</sup>	<i>kosty</i> ,	<i>kosty</i> ,	<i>kostiŭ-ŭ</i> , <sup>16</sup>	<i>kosti</i> , <sup>20</sup>	<i>kosti</i> ,	<i>kosti</i> , <sup>20</sup>	<i>kosti</i>
<i>SYNY</i> , m <sup>6</sup>	<i>syn'</i> ,	<i>syn'</i> ,	<i>syno-my</i> , <sup>17</sup>	<i>synov-i</i> ,	<i>syna</i> , <sup>21</sup>	<i>synŭje</i> , <sup>25</sup>	<i>synŭ</i> <sup>25</sup>
<i>DOMY</i> , m <sup>7</sup>	<i>dom'</i> ,	<i>dom'</i> ,	<i>domo-my</i> ,	<i>domov-i</i> ,	<i>domŭ</i> ,	<i>domŭ</i> ,	<i>dome</i>
<i>VRACHYŭ</i> , m <sup>8</sup>	<i>vrachy'</i> ,	<i>vrachŭ</i> ,	<i>vrache-my</i> ,	<i>vrachev-i</i> ,	<i>vrachya</i> , <sup>23</sup>	<i>vrachi</i> ,	<i>vrachŭjŭ</i>
<i>KAMEN</i> , m <sup>9</sup>	<i>kamy'</i> , <sup>14</sup>	. . .	<i>kamene-my</i> ,	<i>kamen-i</i> ,	<i>kamen-e</i> , <sup>24</sup>	<i>kamen-i</i> ,	. .
<i>IMEN</i> , n <sup>10</sup>	<i>imya</i> ,	<i>imya</i> ,	<i>imene-my</i> ,	<i>imen-i</i> ,	<i>imen-e</i> , <sup>24</sup>	<i>imen-i</i> ,	
<i>MATER</i> , f. <sup>11</sup>	<i>mati</i> ,	. . .	<i>mater-i</i> ,	<i>mater-e</i> , <sup>24</sup>	<i>mater-i</i> ,		
<i>NEBES</i> , n <sup>12</sup>	<i>nebo</i> ,	<i>nebo</i> ,	<i>nebes-my</i> ,	<i>nebes-i</i> ,	<i>nebes-e</i> , <sup>24</sup>	<i>nebes-i</i> ,	.
<i>TELYAT</i> , n <sup>13</sup>	<i>telja</i> ,	<i>telja</i>	<i>tchjate-my</i> ,	<i>tchjati-i</i> ,	<i>tchjati e</i> , <sup>24</sup>	<i>tchjati-i</i> ,	.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. p 273, &c<sup>2</sup> See §§ 253 259<sup>3</sup> Comp pp 275, 276<sup>4</sup> Comp p 285<sup>5</sup> Comp p 286<sup>6</sup> Comp p 288<sup>7</sup> See p 337, Note<sup>8</sup> See § 263<sup>9</sup> Comp p 304

The cases wanting come from *KAMENI* (see § 260), whence also, *kamene-m*, *kamene-ch* (§ 266.); and whence, also, might be derived the dative and locative *kamen-i*, which I prefer, however, deriving from the original theme, just as in *MATER*

<sup>10</sup> Comp § 139<sup>11</sup> See §. 265. and comp p 305<sup>12</sup> Comp p. 306 and § 147<sup>13</sup> See § 264<sup>14</sup> Dobr p 287.<sup>15</sup> See § 266<sup>16</sup> Comp Sanskrit *jihway-ā*, &c See § 266.<sup>17</sup> Comp Lith *pati-mi*, *sunu-mi*<sup>18</sup> Or *rabov*, § 267<sup>19</sup> See § 268

<sup>20</sup> The *i* may also be ascribed to the mark of case, and the dropping of the final letter of the base may be assumed; but in the genitive of the same sound, the *i* clearly belongs to the theme

<sup>21</sup> See § 270<sup>22</sup> See § 271.<sup>23</sup> More commonly *vracha*, and in the vocative, *vrachŭ*

See p 347, Note.

<sup>24</sup> See § 269.<sup>25</sup> See § 268<sup>26</sup> Or *synce*

## PLURAL

[G Ed p 363]

NO I VOC <sup>1</sup>	ACCUS <sup>2</sup>	INSTR <sup>3</sup>	DATIVE <sup>4</sup>	GEN	LOCATIVE <sup>5</sup>
<i>rab i</i>	<i>r b_j</i>	<i>rab_j</i>	<i>rabo-m</i>	<i>rab</i>	<i>ralye-cl</i>
<i>kn_j ě</i>	<i>k n_ja ěja</i>	<i>kn_jo ěi</i>	<i>kn_jo ěe m</i>	<i>k n_ja ěy</i>	<i>kn_j ěe cl</i>
<i>slov</i>	<i>slova</i>	<i>lovy</i>	<i>slovo m</i>	<i>slov</i>	<i>slov je-ch</i>
<i>morya</i>	<i>morya</i>	<i>mori</i>	<i>more-m</i>	<i>mory</i>	<i>morye cl</i>
<i>rodj<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>roly</i>	<i>v da mi</i>	<i>roda m</i>	<i>rod</i>	<i>roda ch</i>
<i>rod_j</i>	<i>rodja</i>	<i>rodja m</i>	<i>rodja m</i>	<i>rodj</i>	<i>rodja-cl</i>
<i>gostj e</i>	<i>gost</i>	<i>gost mī</i>	<i>goste-m</i>	<i>g st'ī</i>	<i>go le ch</i>
<i>ko i</i>	<i>k sti</i>	<i>kost mī</i>	<i>koste m</i>	<i>k st'ī</i>	<i>koste ch</i>
<i>synov e</i>	<i>synory<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>synory<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>synoro-m<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>synov</i>	<i>synorye cl<sup>4</sup></i>
<i>domov e</i>	<i>dom_j</i>	<i>dom_j</i>	<i>domo-m</i>	<i>domov</i>	<i>dome-ch</i>
<i>vrachev e</i>	<i>vrachya</i>	<i>vrachi</i>	<i>vrache-m</i> <i>lamene-m</i>	<i>vrachev</i>	<i>vrache cl</i> <i>lamene-cl</i>
<i>imen a</i>	<i>imen a</i>	<i>i en_j</i>	<i>imene-m</i>	<i>imen</i>	<i>imene-ch</i>
<i>mater e</i>		<i>mater mī</i>	<i>matere-m</i>		
<i>nebes a</i>	<i>nebes a</i>	<i>nebesy</i>	<i>nebe e-m</i>	<i>nebes</i>	<i>nebesje-cl<sup>8</sup></i>
<i>telyat a</i>	<i>telyat a</i>	<i>telyaty</i>	<i>telyate-m</i>	<i>telyat</i>	<i>telyate ch</i>

<sup>1</sup> See § 274

See § 271

<sup>3</sup> See § 275<sup>4</sup> From *SINOVO* see § 276 In the locative occur also *synoro ch* and *synore ch*<sup>5</sup> See § 277<sup>6</sup> See § 276<sup>7</sup> See § 278<sup>8</sup> See 279

One would expect *nebes ch* but in this case *ech* and *ych* are frequently interchanged with one another and the form *ych* appears to agree better with the preceding *s* (comp Dobrowsky p 477)

## ADJECTIVES

[G Ed p 366 ] 281. The declension of the adjective is not distinct from that of the substantive, and if some inflected forms, which in the Sanskrit and Zend belong only to the pronouns, have, in the cognate languages, emerged from the circle of the pronouns, and extended themselves further, they have not remained with the adjectives alone, but have extended themselves to the substantives also. As regards the Greek, Latin, and Slavonic, we have already explained at §§. 228 248. and 274. what has been introduced from pronominal declension in those languages into general declension we will here only further remark that the appended syllable *sma*, in §. 165 &c., which, in Sanskrit, characterises only the pronominal declension, may in the Pâli be combined also, in several cases, with masculine and neuter substantive and adjective bases, and indeed with all bases in *a*, *i*, and *u*, including those which, originally terminating in a consonant, pass by augment or apocope into the vowel declension, thus the ablative and locative singular of *kêsa*, "hair," is either simply *kêsâ* (from *kêsât*, see p 300), *kêsé*, or combined with *sma* or its variation *mha*, *kêsa-smâ*, *kêsa-mhâ*, *kêsa-smu*, *kêsa-mhu*. In the Lithuanian, this syllable, after dropping the *s*, has, in the dative and locative singular, passed over to the adjective declension, without imparting itself to that of the substantive, and without giving to the adjective the licence of renouncing this appended syllable, as, *gêram*, "bono," *geramê*, "in bono." According to this principle it would be possible, and such indeed was lately my intention,

to explain the agreement of the Gothic full adjective dative as *blindamma* (from *blindasma* § 170) with [G Ed p 367] pronominal datives like *thamma* to this *amma* to him but the examination of the Old Slavonic declension, in which the indefinite adjectives remove themselves from all admixture of the pronominal declension and run entirely parallel to the German strong substantive not to the weak has led me to the, to me very important discovery that Grimms strong and Ludas abstract declension form of adjectives diverges in not less than nine points from the strong substantives (i.e. those which terminate in the theme in a vowel) and approaches to the pronominal declension for no other reason than because like the definite adjectives in the Slavonic and Lithuanian they are compounded with a pronoun, which naturally follows its own declension. As then the definite (so I now name the strong) adjectives are defined or personified by a pronoun incorporated with them it is natural that this form of declension should be avoided where the function of the inherent pronoun is discharged by a word which simply precedes it thus we say *guler* or *der gule* not *der guler* which would be opposed to the genius of our language for it still lies in our perception that in *guler* a pronoun is contained as we perceive pronouns in *im am beim* although the pronoun is here no longer present in its original form but has only left behind its case termination. In comprehending however the definite adjective declension the science of Grammar which in many other points had raised itself far above the empirical perception of the language was here still left far behind it and we felt, in forms like *guler gulem gule* more than we recognised namely a pronoun which still operated in spirit although it was no longer bodily present. How acute in this respect our perception is is proved by the fact that we place the definite form of the adjective beside the *ein* when deprived [G Ed 1 368]

of its definitive pronominal element, but, in the oblique cases, beside the definite *eines*, *cinem*, *einen*, the indefinite. *ein grosses*, *eines grossen* (not *grosses*), *cinem grossen* (not *grossen*). In the accusative, *grossen* is at the same time definite and indefinite, but in the former case it is a bare theme, and therefore identical with the indefinite genitive and dative, which is likewise devoid of inflection, but in the latter case the *n* evidently belongs to the inflection

282 The pronominal base, which in Lithuanian and Old Slavonic forms the definite declension, is, in its original form, *ya* (= Sanskrit य *ya*, "which"), and has, in the Lithuanian, maintained itself in this form in several cases (see below). In the Old Slavonic, according to §. 255. (a.), *yo* must be formed from *ya*, and from *yo* again, according to § 255. (n), *ye* or *e* but the monosyllabic nature of the form has preserved it from the suppression of the *y*, which usually takes place in polysyllabic words. In some cases, however, the *y* has vocalized itself to *i* after the vowel has been dropped. It signifies in both languages "he"; but in Old Slavonic has preserved, in union with *sche*, the old relative meaning (*i-sche*, "which"). The complete declension of this pronoun is as follows

## SINGULAR.

	LITHUANIAN		OLD SLAVONIC			
Nominative,	m	<i>ys</i>	f. <i>yi</i> ,	m	<i>i</i> ,	f. <i>ya</i> ,* n <i>ye</i>
Accusative,	m	<i>yn</i> ,	f. <i>yen</i> ,	m	<i>i</i> ,	f. <i>yû</i> , n <i>ye</i> .
Instrumental,	m	<i>yû</i> ,	f. <i>yè</i> ,	m n	<i>im</i> .	f. <i>ye-yû</i> ,
Dative,	m	<i>yám</i> ,	f. <i>yei</i> ,	m. n	<i>yemû</i> ,	f. <i>yei</i> ,
Genitive,	m	<i>yo</i> ,	f. <i>yós</i> ,	m. n	<i>yego</i> ,	f. <i>ye-yo</i> ,
Locative,	m	<i>yamè</i> ,	f. <i>yoyè</i> ,	m n	<i>yem</i> ,	f. <i>yei</i> ,

\* Occurs only as the relative in union with *sche*

## PLURAL

## LITHUANIAN

## OLD SLAVONIC

Nominative,	m	<i>yie (yi), f yos</i>	m	i * f n	<i>ya *</i>
Accusative	m	<i>yūs f yes</i>	m	f n	<i>ya</i>
Instrumental	m	<i>yets f yomis</i>	m	f n	<i>im</i>
Dative	m	<i>yems f yoms</i>	m	f n	<i>im</i>
Genitive	m f	<i>yu</i>	m	f n	<i>ich</i>
Locative	m	<i>yusè, f yosa</i>	m	f n	<i>ich</i>

## DUAL

[G Ed p 369]

## LITHUANIAN

## OLD SLAVONIC

Nominative	m	<i>yu (yu) f yi</i>			
Accusative	m	<i>yun f yin</i>			
Dative	m	<i>yem f yom</i>	Instr Dat	m f n	<i>yima</i>
Genitive	m f	<i>yū</i>	Gen Loc	m f n	<i>yeyu</i>

283 The Lithuanian unites in its definite declension the pronoun cited—which according to Ruhig (Mielcke p 52) signifies the same as the Greek article—with the adjective to be rendered definite so that both the latter and the pronoun preserve their full terminations through all the cases only the pronoun in some cases loses its *y* and the terminations of the adjective are in some cases somewhat shortened *Geras* good will serve as an example

## MASCULINE

## SINGULAR

## DUAL

## PLURAL

Nominative	<i>gérasis †</i>	<i>ger yu</i>	<i>gerieyi</i>
Accusative	<i>geranyan</i>	<i>geruyun</i>	<i>gerūsus</i>
Instrumental,	<i>geruyu</i>		<i>geraisais</i>
Dative	<i>geramyam</i>	<i>giriemsiom ‡</i>	<i>geriemsiems</i>
Genitive	<i>geroyo</i>		<i>gerūyu</i>
Locative	<i>geramyame</i>		<i>gerūsuse</i>
Vocative	<i>gerasis</i>	<i>geruyu</i>	<i>gerieyi</i>

\* See Note on preceding page

† Or *gerassis* by assimilation from *gerasyis* as in the Prakrit *y* frequently assimilates itself to a preceding *s* as *tassa huyus* for तस्य *tasya*

‡ The *s* of the adjective is here not in its place and appears to be borrowed from the plural

## FEMININE.

	SINGULAR	DUAL	PLURAL
Nominative,	<i>geroyi,</i>	<i>gerieyi,</i>	<i>gerosos,</i>
Accusative,	<i>geranyen,</i>	<i>geriyn,</i>	<i>gerases.</i>
Instrumental,	<i>geraye,</i>	....	<i>geromsomis</i>
Dative,	<i>geranyez,</i>	<i>gerómsom,*</i>	<i>geromsoms.</i>
Genitive,	<i>gerosiés,</i>	<i>gerúyá,</i>	<i>gerúyá.</i>
Locative,	<i>geroyoye,</i>	....	<i>gerososa.</i>
Vocative,	<i>geroyi,</i>	<i>geriyyi,</i>	<i>gerosos</i>

[G Ed p 370] 284 The Old Slavonic, differing from the Lithuanian, declines only in some cases\* the adjective together with the appended pronoun, but in most cases the latter alone. While, however, in the Lithuanian the appended pronoun has lost its *y* only in some cases, in the Old Slavonic that pronoun has lost, in many more, not only the *y* but also its vowel, and therefore the whole base. Thus the termination alone is left. For more convenient comparison we insert here, over against one another, the indefinite and definite declension *svyat* (theme *SVYATO*), "holy," may serve for example

## SINGULAR

## MASCULINE

## Indef.

## Def

## FEMININE

## Indef

## Def

Nominative,	<i>svyat,</i>	<i>svyaty-ŭ,<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>svyata</i>	<i>svyata-yu.</i>
Accusative,	<i>svyat,</i>	<i>svyaty-ŭ,<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>svyatú,</i>	<i>svyatú-yú</i>
Instrumental,	<i>svyatom,</i>	<i>svyaty-m,<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>svyatoyú,</i>	<i>svyato-yú<sup>3</sup></i>
Dative,	<i>svyatú,</i>	<i>svyato-mú,</i>	<i>svyatye,</i>	<i>svyato-ŭ.<sup>4</sup></i>
Genitive,	<i>svyata,</i>	<i>svyata-go,</i>	<i>svyaty,</i>	<i>svyaty-ya</i>
Locative,	<i>svyatye,</i>	<i>svyato-m,<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>svyatye,</i>	<i>svyato-ŭ.<sup>4</sup></i>

\* See Note † on preceding page

<sup>1</sup> See § 255 *d*      <sup>2</sup> Or *svaty-m*, in which, as in the Lithuanian, the adjective is inflected at the same time

<sup>3</sup> The indefinite and definite forms are here the same, for this reason, that *svyato-yeyú*, as the latter must originally have been written, has dropped the syllable *ye*. The adjective base *svyata* has weakened its *o* to *a* before the pronominal addition (§ 255 *a*), just as in the dative and locative *svyato-ŭ*, where an external identity with the indefinite form is not perceptible

<sup>4</sup> Or *svaty-ŭ* Comp Note 2

## PI URAL

	MASCULINE		FEMININE	
	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>
Nominative	<i>svyati</i>	<i>svyati i</i>	<i>svyaty</i>	<i>svyaty ya</i>
Accusative	<i>svyaty</i>	<i>svyaty-ya</i>	<i>svyaty</i>	<i>svyaty-ya</i>
Instrumental	<i>svyaty,</i>	<i>svyaty imi</i> <sup>6</sup>	<i>svyata-mi</i>	<i>svyaty imi</i> <sup>7</sup>
Dative	<i>svyatom</i>	<i>svyaty imi</i> <sup>6</sup>	<i>svyata-m</i>	<i>svyaty im</i> <sup>7</sup>
Genitive,	<i>svyat</i>	<i>svyaty ich</i>	<i>svyat</i>	<i>svyaty ich</i>
Locative	<i>svyatyech</i>	<i>svyaty ich</i> <sup>6</sup>	<i>svyata ch</i>	<i>svyaty ich</i> <sup>7</sup>

## SINGULAR

## PI URAL

	NEUTER			
	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>
Nom Accu	<i>svyato</i>	<i>svyato-e</i>	<i>svyata</i>	<i>svyata ya</i>

The rest like the masculine

<sup>6</sup> I give those forms which according to Dobrowsky (p 302) occur in the oldest MSS in place of the more ordinary forms which have *i* at the *s* of the pronominal base *svyaty mi svyat, m svyaty ch*

<sup>7</sup> Although in the pronominal declension the genitive plural is externally identical with the locative we must nevertheless in my opinion separate the two cases, in respect to their origin. I find however the reason of their agreement in this that the Sanskrit which in this case is most exactly followed by the German and Slavonic in pronouns of the third person begins the plural genitive termination with a sibilant Sanskrit *sām* Gothic *zē* (for *zē* § 248) Thus *s* then has in Old Slavonic become *ch* just like that of the locative characteristic *су* *su* (§ 249) The nasal of *साम्* *sum* must according to rule be lost (§ 255 *l*) the vowel however has contrary to rule followed it as also in the ordinary declension the termination *ām* has entirely disappeared (§ 248) and the same relation which *men nōminum* has to the Gothic *naman ē tye-ch* *horum* has to *thi e* This *tye-ch* however answers as genitive to the Sanskrit *तेषाम्* *tē shām*, and as locative to *तेषु* *tē shu*, *ye* being used in both cases for *zē* according to § 255 (*e*)

<sup>8</sup> See Notes 5 and 6 The identity with the masculine and neuter forms arises from this, that the grave *a* of the feminine adjective base is changed into the lighter *o*, and this again as in the masculine neuter is converted according to § 225 (*d*, into *y*





equal footing with Grimm's *stroog* declension of substantives & *e* they maintain themselves without an unorganic consonantal augment in the genuine original limits of their base

286 As the feminine where it is not identical as in adjective bases in *i* in the Sanskrit Greek and Latin with the theme of the masculine and neuter, is always in the Indo-European family of languages made to diverge through an extension or an addition to the end it is important for German Grammar to remark—and I have already called attention to this point in another place—that the feminine of the German indefinite adjective in variance from the principle which has been [G Ed p 373]

just given has not arisen from its masculine but from an older form of the feminine *e.g.* the primitive feminine *BLINDAM* m n "blind" has extended itself in the indefinite to *BLINDAN* and the primitive feminine *BLINDŌ* to *BLINDŌN* one must not therefore derive the latter although it is the feminine of *BLINDAN* m from this as it is entirely foreign to the Indo-European family of languages to derive a feminine base through the lengthening of the last letter but one of the masculine and neuter. As far as regards the declension of *BLINDAN* m it follows precisely that of *AIMAN* (p 322 G ed) and *BLINDAN* n, that of *NAMAN* (p 176 G ed &c) the fem *BLINDŌN* differs from the masculine only by a more regular inflection since its *ō* remains everywhere unchanged while *a* in the genitive and dative singular is according to § 132 weakened to *i* therefore—

	MASCULINE		NEUTER		FEMININE	
Theme	<i>BLINDAN</i>		<i>BLINDAN</i>		<i>BLINDŌN</i>	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
N V	<i>blinda</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>blindan s</i>	<i>blindō</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>blindōn-a</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>blindō,</i>	<i>blindōn s</i>
Acc	<i>blindan</i>	<i>blindan s,</i>	<i>blindō</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>blindon a</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>blindōn</i>	<i>blindon s</i>
Dat	<i>blindin</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>blinda m</i>	<i>blindin</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>blinda m</i>	<i>blindon</i>	<i>blindon-m</i>
Gen	<i>blindin s</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>blindan ē</i>	<i>blindin s</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>blindon ē</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>blindōn s</i>	<i>blindōn ō</i> <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See § 140

<sup>2</sup> See § 141

<sup>3</sup> See § 240

287. In order, then, to examine the definite declension of adjectives in Gothic, we will, in the first place, for the purpose of bringing into view their agreement and discrepancy with substantives and simple pronouns, place by the side of each other the declension of the definite *BLINDA* m. n. and *BLINDŌ* f., and that of *VULFA* m., "wolf," *DAURA* n., "a gate," *GIBŌ* f., a gift," and the interrogative [G Ed p 374] *HVA* m. n., "who?" "what?" *HVŌ* f., further, that of *MIDYA* m. n. (*medius*), *MIDYŌ* f., by that of *HARYA* m., "an army," *BADYA* n., "a bed," *KUNTHYŌ* f., "news," and *HVARYA* m. n., "who?" "what?" *HVARYŌ* f.

## MASCULINE.

## SINGULAR

## PLURAL

N.	<i>vulf's</i> ,	<i>blind's</i> ,	<i>hva-s</i> , <sup>1</sup>	<i>vulfōs</i> , <sup>2</sup>	<i>blindai</i> ,	<i>hvai</i> , <sup>3</sup>
A.	<i>vulf'</i> ,	<i>blindana</i> ,	<i>hva-na</i> ,	<i>vulfa-ns</i> ,	<i>blindans</i> ,	<i>hva-ns</i>
D	<i>vulfa</i> , <sup>4</sup>	<i>blindamma</i> ,	<i>hva-mma</i> , <sup>5</sup>	<i>vulfa-m</i> ,	<i>blindaim</i> ,	<i>hvai-m</i>
G	<i>vulfi-s</i> ,	<i>blindis</i> ,	<i>hvi-s</i> ,	<i>vulf'-ē</i> ,	<i>blindaižē</i> ,	<i>hvi-zē</i> .
V.	<i>vulf'</i> ,	<i>blind's</i> ,	...	<i>vulfōs</i> ,	<i>blindai</i> ,	....
N	<i>haryi-s</i> , <sup>6</sup>	<i>midyis</i> , <sup>7</sup>	<i>hvaryi-s</i> ,	<i>haryōs</i> , <sup>2</sup>	<i>midyai</i> ,	<i>hvaryai</i> . <sup>3</sup>
A	<i>hari</i> , <sup>8</sup>	<i>midyana</i> ,	<i>hvarya-na</i> ,	<i>harya-ns</i> ,	<i>midyans</i> ,	<i>hvarya-ns</i>
D	<i>harya</i>	<i>midyamma</i> ,	<i>hvarya-mma</i> ,	<i>harya-m</i> ,	<i>midyaim</i> ,	<i>hvaryai-m</i>
G	<i>haryi-s</i> ,	<i>midyis</i> ,	<i>hvary-is</i> ,	<i>hary-ē</i> ,	<i>midyaižē</i> ,	<i>hvaryaižē</i>
V	<i>hari</i> ,	<i>midyis</i> ,	....	<i>haryōs</i> ,	<i>midyai</i> ,	...

<sup>1</sup> See § 135<sup>2</sup> See § 228<sup>3</sup> See §. 171<sup>4</sup> See § 227<sup>5</sup> See § 160<sup>6</sup> From *harya-s*, see § 135

<sup>7</sup> The nominative in adjective bases in *ya* does not occur, unless perhaps in the fragments which have last appeared, and I have here formed it by analogy with *haryis* and *hvaryis*. Grimm gives *midis* (I 170). If, i. e., the form *yis* is considered as unorganic, and, in regard to *midis*, if its analogy with *hardus* is remembered, then Grimm is wrong in taking *MIDI* for the theme, as in reality *HARDU* is the theme of *hardus*. The true theme *MIDYA* occurs, however, in the comp. *midya-sveipans*, "deluge," and

## NEUTER

## SINGULAR

## PLURAL

N A V	daur	blindata <sup>9</sup>	hva <sup>9</sup>	daura	blinda	hið
-------	------	-----------------------	------------------	-------	--------	-----

The rest like the masculine

N A V	badi	midyata <sup>9</sup>	hvarya ta	badya	midya	hvarya
-------	------	----------------------	-----------	-------	-------	--------

The rest like the masculine

## FEMININE

[G Ed p 375]

## SINGULAR

## PLURAL

N	giba	blinda	hvo	gibðs <sup>2</sup>	blindos	hiðs <sup>2</sup>
A	giba	blinda	hið <sup>11</sup>	gibð s	blindðs	hvð-s
D	gibai <sup>12</sup>	blindai <sup>1</sup>	hvi ai <sup>13</sup>	gibð m	blindaim	hvi m
G	gibð s	blindai ðs <sup>13</sup>	hvið s <sup>13</sup>	gib ð	blindai o	hvi zð
V	giba	blinda?		gibðs	blindðs	
N	kunthi <sup>14</sup>	midya	hvarya	kunthyðs <sup>2</sup>	midyðs <sup>2</sup>	hvaryos <sup>2</sup>
A	kunthya	midya	hvarya	kunthyðo-s	midyðs	hvaryð s
D	kunthyai <sup>12</sup>	midyai <sup>12</sup>	hvaryai <sup>12</sup>	kunthyð m	midyom	hvaryð m
G	kunthyð-s	midyaizos	hvaryai os <sup>13</sup>	kunthyð	midyð	hvaryð o
V	kunthi	midya		kunthyðs	midyðs	hvaryðs

answers to the Sanskrit मध्य *madhya* Formed from *midya* as theme *midys* would be clearly more organic than *mid s* Adjective bases which could be referred to *hardu s* as *u* base do not exist but only substantive as *GASTI* nom *gasts*

<sup>8</sup> Compare Zend forms like *tuur m*, *quantum* from *tūrya* (§ 42)

<sup>9</sup> *Hia* with suppressed termination for *hiata* Old High German *huaz* see §§ 150 156 for *blindata* also *blind* and so for *midyata* also *mid*

<sup>10</sup> The form *hvo* which like some others of this pronoun cannot be shewn to occur is by Grimm, rightly formed by analogy from *thð* "*hæc*" Grimm here finds as also in the accusative singular the *o* in opposition to the *a* of *blinda* surprising the reason of the deviation however is fixed by §§ 69 137 231

<sup>11</sup> See p 173 Note †

<sup>12</sup> See § 161

<sup>13</sup> § 172

<sup>14</sup> For *kunthya*, from *kunthyðo* by suppression of the final vowel of the base which again appears in the accusative but shortened to *a* (see § 69) but here also the final vowel can be dropped, hence *kunthi* as accusative Luc 1 77

If, then, it is asked which pronoun is contained in the German definite adjective, I answer, the same which, in Slavonic

[G Ed p 376] and Lithuanian, renders the adjective definite, namely, the Indian relative *ya* (य या). This pronoun in German, indeed, in disadvantageous comparison with the Lithuanian and Slavonic, does not occur isolated in its inflected state, but it is not uncommon in the history of languages, that a word has been lost in regard to its isolated use, and has been preserved only in composition with other words. It should be observed, too, that a demonstrative *i* base must be acknowledged to belong to the Sanskrit, which, in Latin, is completely declined; in Gothic almost completely, but in Sanskrit, except the neuter nominative accusative *idam*, "this," has maintained itself only in derivative forms, as इति *i-ti*, इत्थम् *it tham*, "so," इत्य- *iy-at*, "so much," इदं *i-dam*, "such." The case is the same in Gothic, with the pronominal base *ya* from this comes, in my opinion, the affirmative particle *ya*, as in other languages, also, affirmation is expressed by pronominal forms (*i-tu*, तथा *ta-thā*, "so," οὕτως, and further *yabai*, "if," analogous with *ibai*, "whether," *ibaini*, "lest", as also, in Sanskrit, यदि *yadi*, "if," comes from the same base, and to this, as I now believe, the Greek *ei* the semi-vowel being laid aside—has the same relation as in Piākrit, in the 3d person singular present, *ai, e g* भ्रमन् *bhaman*, "he wanders" (Uivasi by Lenz, p 63), has to the more usual अदि *adi*, for the Sanskrit अति *ati*. In Prākrit, too, अज् *ja* (l. c p. 63 on *j* for *y*, see § 19.), really occurs for *yadi*; so that in this conjunction, as in the 3d person of the present λέγει from λέγειν), the Greek runs parallel to the corruption of the Piākrit. If, however, in *ei* the Sanskrit य *y* has disappeared, as in the Æolic ὅμμες=Sanskrit *yushmê*, it appears as *h* in ὅς, which has nothing to do with the article ὁ, ἡ, where *h* falls only to the nominative masculine and feminine, while in ὅς it runs through all the cases, as

in Sanskrit the य *y* of यस् *ya s* To this [G Ed p 37] यस *yas* os in regard to the rough breathing bears the same relation as *υμεις* to युष्मे *yushmē* ἄλλω ἄγιοις to यन् *yaj* to worship to sacrifice यन् *yanya* to be worshipped, *υσμιν* to युष् *yudh* to strive युष् *yudhma* strife (comp Pott pp 236 252) But to return to the Gothic *YA* let us further observe *yah* \* and also, with *h* enclitic of which hereafter and *yu* now *ie* at this time" already (comp Latin *jam*) It also clearly forms the last portion of *hvar-yis* (for *yas*) as in the Slavonic this pronoun often unites itself with almost all others and for example is contained in *ky* : who? although the interrogative base also occurs without this combination

288 In Gothic definite adjectives the pronominal base *YA* shews itself most plainly in bases in *u* Of these indeed there are but a few, which we annex below † but a *ya* shews itself in all the cases and these in *blinds* differ from the substantive declension to such an extent that before the *y* the *u* of the adjective is suppressed as in Sanskrit before the comparative and superlative suffixes *yas ishtha* e.g. *laghuyas* more light *laghushtha* most light, for *laghu iyas laghu-ishtha* from *laghu* and as even in Gothic, *hard izd*, more hard (according to

\* The *h* may assimilate itself to the initial consonant of the following word, and thus may arise *yag yan* and *yas* and in conjunction with *thē* *yattl ē* or (see Massmann's Gloss)

† *Aggvus*, narrow *aglus* heavy *glaggvus* industrious *hardus*, 'hard *manvus* ready *thaurus*, dry, *thlaqvus* tender, *sesthus*, late *filus* much and probably *hnasqvus* 'tender Some occur only as adverbs as *glagguv ba* industriously In addition to the adverb *filu* much since Grimm treated this subject the genitive *filaus* has been found (*filaus mais* 'for much more see Massmann's Gloss) which is the more gratifying as the adjective *u* bases had not yet been adduced in this case

[G Ed. p. 378.] Massmann, p. 48), for *hardv-izō* from *HARDU*. Hitherto, however, only the accusative singular masculine *thaurś-yana*, "*siccum*," *manv'-yana*, "*paratum*", the accusative singular neuter *manv'-yata*, the dative plural *hnasqv'-yaim* are adduceable, if Grimm, as I doubt not, is right in ascribing to this word, which is not to be met with in any other case, a nominative *hnasqvus*\* Finally, also, the accusative plural masculine *unmanv'-yans*, ἀπαρ-σκειάστους (2 C. 9. 4), although, in this case, *blindans* is not different from *vulfans*. These examples, then, although few, furnish powerful proof, because, in the cases to be met with, they represent an entire class of words viz. the definite adjective in *u*\* in such a manner, that not a single variety of form occurs. It may be proper to annex here the complete definite declension of *MANVU*, as it is either to be met with, or, according to the difference of cases, is, with more or less confidence, to be expected.

## MASCULINE.

## FEMININE.

	SINGULAR.	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
N.	<i>manvu-s</i> ,	( <i>manv'-yai</i> ),	<i>manvu-s</i> ,	( <i>manv'-yōs</i> ).
Ac	<i>manv'-ya-na</i> ,	<i>manv'-ya-ns</i> ,	( <i>manv'-ya</i> ),	( <i>manv'-yōs</i> ),
D	( <i>manv'-ya-mma</i> ),	<i>manv'-yai-m</i> ,	( <i>manv'-yai</i> ),	( <i>manv'-yaim</i> ).
G.	<i>manvu-s</i> ,	( <i>manv'-yazē</i> ),	( <i>manv'-yazōs</i> ),	( <i>manv'-yazō</i>

[G Ed p. 379]

## NEUTER.

## SINGULAR

## PLURAL

Nom Accus. *manv'-ya-ta*,† (*manv'-ya*)

\* I am the more inclined to agree with him, as a few other adjective bases in *vu* occur. Perhaps a euphonic influence of the *v* on the vowel which follows it is also at work, as at times one finds in the Prākṛit a final *a* changed through the influence of a preceding *ṣ*, *ṣ*, or *ḷ*, to *u*. So Urvasi, p 72, *ālu*, *tālu*, *āvaṇanu*, for *kāla*, *tāla*, *āvaṇana*, p 71, *manōharu* for *mānōhara*.

† Without inflection and pronom. *manvu*, as *swādū*, *īdū*, Lithuanian *darkū*

Remark 1 —Grimm finds (I 721 ) the identity of the feminine with the masculine remarkable since he as it appears looks upon *s* as an originally mere masculine termination (comp l c 824 825 <sup>2 3</sup>) That however the feminine has equal claim to *s* as the nominative character and that it is entirely without inflection where this is wanting I think I have shewn in §§ 134 137 Adjective bases in *i* which in the Gothic as in the Lithuanian and Slavonic are wanting end in the Sanskrit, Greek and Latin in the nominative of both genders in *is* and only the neuter is devoid of inflection compare सुखं *suchi s m f* clear *suchi n* with ἁπλῆς *ἁπλῆς* *facili s facile* Adjectives in *u* in Sanskrit frequently leave in like manner the feminine base undistinguished from the masculine and neuter and then end according to § 234 in the nominative in *us* so *pāndu-s m f* agrees with *manvu s* above and the neuter *pāndu* with *manvu* If two consonants do not precede the final *u* as in *pāndu* the feminine base may except in compound words be lengthened by an *i* which is particularly characteristic of this gender and thus सुदुः सुदुः the sweet (themo and nominative) answers to the Greek word ἡδέα which is lengthened by an unorganic *a* (§ 119 ) for ἡδέα, and *suādu s* answers both as feminine and masculine nominative to the Gothic *manvus* In the Sanskrit also a short *u* in the feminine base may be lengthened and thus the feminine of तनु *tanu* *thnu* is either *tanu* or *tanū* whence the nominative *tanū s* and *tanu i* as substantive means the slender woman The Lithuanian has adjective bases in *u* as *szwiesu s m* light clear (compare श्वेत *sueta* white ) which nevertheless in several cases replace the *u* by *a* as *szwiesam dangui* to the bright heaven in some too they prefix an *i* to the *a* the assimilating power of which changes the *a* into *e* (comp p 169 Note) as *szwiesiems dangums* to the bright heavens The feminine is in the nominative *szwiesi* the



[G Ed p. 380] final *ι* of which is evidently identical with the Sanskrit  $\text{इ}$  *i* in *suādwī*. In the oblique cases, however, an unorganic *a* also is added to the Lithuanian *ι*, as it has been in  $\eta\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ : this *ia*, however, becomes either by euphony, *e* (comp p 174, Note \*), e. g. accus. *szwiesen*, accus plural *szwiesès*; or it happens, and that, indeed, in the majority of cases that the *ι* is entirely suppressed, so that *SZWIESA* passes as the theme, as *szwiesès rankès*, "of the bright hand" (gen. *szwiesai rankai* (dat.) The *ι* of *ia*, however, appears, as with the participles, to have communicated itself from the feminine to the masculine,

"Remark 2. With the accusative *manvyana* which has been cited, the conjectured dative *manvyamma* is least doubtful. That Grimm should suggest forms like *hardvamma*, *hardv-ana*, arises from his regarding *amma*, *ana*, as the dative and accusative terminations of the pronoun and adjective, while, in fact, the terminations are simply *mma* and *na*. When, therefore, *HARDU*, in the dative and accusative, without annexing a pronoun, follows nevertheless the pronominal declension, the cases mentioned must be written *hardu-mma*, *hardu-na*, analogous with *tha-mma*, *tha-na*, *ι-mma*, *ι-na*. If, however, contrary to all expectation, forms like *hardvamma*, *hardvana*, shew themselves, they must be deduced from *hardu-ya-mma*, *hardu-ya-na*, so that after suppressing the *y*, the preceding *u*, in the place in which it would be left, has passed into *v*. With regard to *blindamma*, *blindana*, *blindata*, it is doubtful whether they ought to be divided *blind'-(y)amma*, *blind'-(y)ana*, *blind'-(y)ata*, as analogous with *manv(u)-yamma*, *manv(u)-yana*, *manv(u)-yata*, or *blinda-(ya)mma*, &c I have therefore left them, as also the corresponding forms from *MIDYA*, undivided. If the division *blinda-mma*, &c is made, nothing is left of the pronoun, as in the Old Sclavonic dative *siyato-mû*, and as in our expressions like *beim*, *am*, *im*, except the case-termination, and the adjective base

has preserved its *a*. If however the division *blind amma* &c is made to which I now give the preference and which is also adopted by Grimm though from a different point of view then the pronoun has only lost its *y* as in some cases of the Lithuanian definite *eg* in *gerus us* for *gerūs yus* (see p 353) and with respect to the *y* which has been dropped and the vowel which is left *blind-amma* would have the same relation to *blind-yamma* as *midums* ' the middle man (theme *MIDUMA*) to its Sanskrit cognate form of the same import मध्यम *madhyama* whose relation to *MIDUMA* I thus trace—the latter has softened the first *a* to *i* and has changed the middle *a* through the influence of the liquid into *u* and both, however have according to § 66 suppressed the semi vowel

“Remark 3—Although in the accusative plural masculine *blindans* is not different from *vulfans* and the simple word *BLINDA* could not form ought but [G Ed p 381] *blinda ns*, nevertheless the word *man yans* mentioned above which is of the highest importance for the Grammar as well as the circumstance that where any inflections peculiar to the pronoun admonish us of the existence of an inherent pronoun in the definite adjective, this inheritance really exists—these two reasons I say speak in favour of dividing, thus *blind-ans*, and of deducing it from *blind-yans*. Just in the same manner the dative *blindam*, both through the *aim* which occurs elsewhere only in pronouns as through the word *hnasqv-yaim* mentioned above declares itself to be an abbreviation of *blind yaim* but *blindai* proves itself only by its pronominal inflection (compare *thai hva*, Sanskrit ते ते के के) to be an abbreviation of *blind-ya*

Remark 4—In the Sanskrit in some cases an *i* blends itself with the final *a* which with the *a* of the base becomes *ē* hence the instrumental plural of the Veda dialect and of the Prakrit अस्मिन् *asmi bhīs* from *asua* कुसुमे *kusumē hin* from *kusuma*. To this *ē* answers the *ai* in

Gothic pronominal datives like *hvar-m*, "quibus," *tha-im*, "his"; as the German dative, in accordance with its origin, is identical with the old instrumental. We were, however, compelled, before we had a reason for seeking the pronoun *YA* in the Gothic definite adjective, to give to the extension of the base in German a wider expansion by an *z* which means nothing, than it has in the Sanskrit; while we have now every reason, where, in Gothic definites, an *z* unsubstantiated by the oldest grammar shews itself, to recognise in the *z* a remnant of the pronominal base *YA*, either as a vocalization of the *y*, which so often occurs in the Slavonic (see p. 354), or the *z* may be considered as an alteration of the *a* of *YA*, as in the Lithuanian *geras-is* for *geras-yis*, (p. 353). The latter view pleases me the better because it accords more closely with *blind'-amma*, *blind'-ana*, &c., from *blind'-yamma*, *blind'-yana*. The vowel, then, which in *blind'-amma*, &c., maintains itself in its original form, appears, in this view, as *z* in the feminine singular genitive *blindarizós* which is to be divided *blindarizós* from *blindar-yizós*, and this *yizós* is analogous with *hvizós*, *thizós*, from *hvarzós*, *tharzós*, = Sanskrit *lasyás*, *tasyás* (§. 172). We must not require *blindó-izós* because *BLINDŌ* is the feminine adjective base for there is a reason for the thinning of the *ó*, in the difficulty of placing the syllables together, and *a* is the short of *ó* (§. 69). For the rest, let it be considered, that in the Slavonic the graver feminine *a* before its union with the pronoun is weakened to the lighter masculine *o* (p. 354, Note 3.), and that a diphthong *oi* in the Gothic [G Ed p 382] is never admissible, on which account *salbó*, "I anoint," in the subjunctive suppresses the *z*, which belongs to this mood (*salbós*, *salbó*, for *salbóis*, *salbói*). In the feminine dative one should expect *blindarizar* for *blindar*, which is simple, and answers to *gibaz*, while the remaining German dialects are, in this case, compounded in the very

same manner in Old High German the genitive is *plintera* and the dative *plinteru*\* In the genitive plural masculine and neuter the *ai* in *blindai ze* might be substantiated through the Sanskrit *ꣳ* *é* of the pronominal genitive as *ꣳꣳꣳ teshām horum*, and therefore the division *blindai ze* or *blind (y)ai ze* should be made as however the monosyllabic pronominal bases in which one would rather expect a firm adherence to the old diphthong (comp § 137) do not retain it and *thi ze horum hvi zé quorum* as weakened forms of *tha zé hva ze*, are used and in the feminine *thi zô hvi zô*, for *thô zo*, *hiô zo*, = Sanskrit *tā sam kâ sam* I therefore prefer to substantiate in a different way the *ai* in *blindai ze* *m n* and *blindai zo f* than by the Sanskrit *é* of *te sham m n* (*f tu sām*) which moreover, would not be applicable to the feminine form *blindai zô* and I do it in fact, by the pronominal base *YA*, so that *blindai ze blinda i zo* is the division to be made according to the analogy of *blindai zo*

“Remark 5 —The nominative masculine and feminine has kept itself free, in Gothic from union with the old relative base and has remained resting upon the original as received from the Sanskrit, Greek and Latin The masculine *blinds* also through the very characteristic and animated *s* (see § 134) has cause to feel itself personified and defined determinately enough Even if *blinds* could be looked upon as an abbreviation of *blindais* (comp *althais* ‘old,’ from the base *ALTHYA* according to Massmann) or of *blindais* to which the Old High German *plinter* would give authority I should still believe that neither the one nor the other has existed in Gothic as even the *u* bases

\* The Gothic *ai* would lead us to expect *é* and this, too is given by Grimm As, however with Kero the doubling of the vowel, and with Nother the circumflex is wanting I adopt in preference a shortening of the *e* or leave the quantity undecided

like *manvu-s* above, which, in the oblique cases, shew so clearly the pronominal base *YA*, have not received it in the nominative singular of the personal genders. In Old High German, however, the pronoun spoken of has had time, in the space of almost four centuries which intervene between its oldest memorials and Ulfilas, to raise itself up from the oblique cases to the nominative, which was the more desirable, as the Old High German substantive declen-

[G Ed. p 383] sion in the nominative masculine, in disadvantageous comparison with the Gothic, omits the mark of case. *Plintêr* (the length of the *ê* is here rendered certain) is contracted from *plinta-ir* (for *plinta-yu*), for the Old High German *ê* corresponds, according to §. 78., to the Gothic *ai*. In the feminine, therefore, the form *plintyu*, which occurs in the chief number of strict Old High German authorities, and those which, as Grimm remarks, are the oldest of all, has good substantiation, and corresponds very fitly to the masculine *plintêr*, and in the nominative and accusative plural and neuter the form *plint-yu*, with regard to the retaining the *y* of the pronoun, is more genuine than the Gothic *blind-a* for *blind-ya*. The form *plintyu*, moreover, answers to feminine pronominal forms like *dyy*, "the" (f.), *syu*, "she," *desyu* (*de-syu*), "this"\* (f.), and to the instrumental masculine and neuter *dyy* (in the interrogative *huyu*), where all authorities concur in retaining the *z* or *y*, while in the adjective, Otfrið, and, as Grimm remarks, here and there Isidore and Tatian, have *u* for *yu*. For explanation,

\* As in the Old High German *i* and *j* (*y*) are not distinguished in writing, it remains uncertain in many, if not in all cases, in what places of the memorials which have come down to us the sound *j*, and in what that of *i* is intended; as even where the Gothic has a *j*, it may become *i* in the Old High German. If, however, in the analogous adjective forms like *plintyu* one reads *j*, which is supported by the Gothic (p 362), we must, in my opinion, leave it in the above forms also. Grimm writes *duu*, *suu*, but *desyu*, and expresses, p 791, his opinion regarding the *i*

however of the pronominal forms which have been mentioned it is important to consider that in the Sanskrit the pronominal base *ta* or the *sa* which supplies its place in the nominative masculine and feminine unites itself with the relative base *ya* by which the first pronoun loses its vowel Compare then—

SANSKRIT	OLD HIGH GERM	OLD SLAVONIC
स्या <i>syā</i> (= <i>syā</i> ) hæc	<i>syu dyu</i>	<i>ta ya</i>
ताम् <i>tyām</i> hanc	<i>dya</i>	<i>tu yu</i>
ते <i>tyē</i> hi	<i>dye</i>	<i>ti i</i>
तास् <i>tyās</i> hæc has	<i>dyō</i>	<i>ty ya</i>
तानि <i>tyani</i> hæc	<i>dyu</i>	<i>ta-ya</i>

Here then in a manner as remarkable as convincing the relation is proved in which the Old High German forms mentioned stand to the Gothic *so tho thar* [G Ed p 384] *thōs thō* one must first transpose these into *syu thyo* &c before they can pass as original forms for the Old High German Our mother tongue however in the east before us obtains more explanation through the Slavonic where the demonstrative base *TO* may indeed be simply inflected through all the cases in several however which we have partly given above it occurs also in union with *YO* It is most probable that in the Old High German the combination of the base of the article with the old relative pronoun has extended itself over all the cases of the three genders for that it does not belong to the feminine alone is seen from the masculine and neuter instrumental form *dyu* (*d yu*) and from the dative plural where together with *dēm* occurs also *dyēm* (*diēm*) and in Notker always *dien* \*According to this I deduce the forms *der des demu* &c from *dyer dyes* (for *dys*) *dyemu* (from *dyamu*) so that after suppression of the vowel following the *y* that letter has vocalized itself first to *i* and thence to *e* According to this therefore *des* and the Gothic genitive

*thu-s*, would be, in their origin, just as different as in the accusative feminine *dya'* and *thô*. In the neuter, on the other hand, *daz* for *dya-z*, as Gothic *blind'-ata* for *blind-yata*—the vowel of the base *DYĀ* is left, and the semi-vowel, which above had become *i* (from *ɾ*) has disappeared. Further support of my views regarding the difference of bases in the Gothic *thu-na* and the Old High German *de-n* (I give the accusative intentionally) is furnished by the demonstrative *des-ir*, which I explain as compounded, and as, in fact, a combination of the Sanskrit *तया*, mentioned at p 383 G. ed., for *taya*, and *स्य* for *sa-ya*, the latter of which has a full declension in the Old Slavonic, also, as a simple word. *Des-ir* stands, therefore, for *dya-sar* (*e=ai*), and our Modern German *dieser* rests, in fact, upon a more perfect dialectic form than that which is preserved to us in the above *des-ir*, namely, upon *dya-s-ir* or *da-s-ir*, referred to which the Isidorean *dhia-sa*, mentioned by Grimm (I. 795.), at least in respect of the first syllable, no longer appears strange, for *dhia* from *dhya* for *dhya*,<sup>2</sup> answers admirably to the Sanskrit *तया*, and the final syllable *sa* answers to the Sanskrit-Gothic nominative form *sa* (Greek *ô*), which has not the sign of case.

"Remark 6. The adjective bases which from their first origin end in *ya*, as *MIDYĀ*=Sanskrit *madhya*, are less favourable to the retention of the *y* of the definite pronoun, for to the feminine or plural neuter *plint'-yu* for *plinta-yu* a *midy'-yu* would be analogous, which, on account of the diffi-

[G Ed p 385] culty of pronouncing it, does not occur, but may have originally existed in the form *midya-yu*, or *mid-ya-ya*; for the masculine nominative *midy-er* is from *midya-u* for *midya-ya*, as, in Gothic, the feminine genitive-form *midyazôs* from *midya-yizôs*. If, however, according to this, even *hvar-yazôs* (from *hvar-yayizôs*) be used, and analogous

\* *D*, *th*, and *dh* are interchanged according to different authorities

forms in several other cases so that the base *JA* is therein doubled we must recollect that in the Lithuanian also the base *JA* besides its composition with adjectives combines itself also with itself for stronger personification and indeed in such a manner that it is then doubly declined as *yis sai* (for *yis-yai*\*) he *yo-yo* of him &c

289 The participle present has in Gothic preserved only the nominative singular masculine of the definite declension e.g. *gibands* giving which may be deduced as well from a theme *GIBAND* according to the analogy of *fiyands* (see p 164) as from *GIBANDA* according to the analogy of *wulf s* (§ 135) The Pali (see p 300) and Old High German support the assumption of a theme *GIBANDA* as an extension of the original *GIBAND* whence then by a new addition the indefinite theme *GIBANDIN* has arisen as above *BLINDAN* from *BIINDA* and it is very probable that all unorganic *n* bases have been preceded by an older with a vowel termination for as all bases which terminate in a consonant (*nd r* and *n* § 125) are in their declension with the exception of the nominative *nd s* alike obtuse [G Ed p 306] so it would not be necessary for *GIBAND* in order to belong in the indefinite adjective to a weak theme or one with a blunted declension to extend itself to *gibandan* (compare p 302) unless for the sake of the nominative *gibanda* (see § 110)

290 In the Pali no feminine theme *charanti* has been formed from the unorganic theme *charanta* mentioned at p 319 G ed

\* Ruhig (by Mielke 1 68) wrongly gives *ai* as the emphatic adjunct as the doubling of the *s* in *tassai, s issai, yissai* is clearly to be explained through the assimilative power of the *y* (see p 323 Note †) The termination *ai* answers to the neuter *tai* mentioned at § 157, for *tai* which latter is contained in the compound *tat tai* (comp *koh tai tol tai*) After two consonants however the *y* is entirely dropped hence e.g. *kurs-ai* not *kurs-yai*



for the masculine and neuter form *charanta* has arisen from the necessity of passing from a class of declensions terminating in a consonant into one more convenient, terminating with a vowel in the theme. The Sanskrit, however, forms from bases terminating in a consonant the feminine theme by the addition of a vowel (*i*, see § 119.); e. g. from *charant m*, comes *charanti*, and there was therefore no reason in the Pâli to give also to the more recent form *charanta* a feminine theme *charanti*. Here, again, the Gothic stands in remarkable accordance with the Pâli, for it has produced no feminine base *GIBANDŌ* from the presupposed *GIBANDA*, and therefore, also, the indefinite *GIBANDAN* has no feminine, *GIBANDŌN*, nom *gibandō*, answering to it (as *BLINDŌN* to *BLINDAN*); but the feminine form *gibandei* (*ei=i*, § 70.), which has arisen from the old theme *GIBAND*, in analogy with the Sanskrit *charanti*, has become *GIBANDEIN*, by the later addition of an *n*. Hence, according to §. 142, in the nominative *gibandei* must have arisen. It is not, however, right to regard this nominative as a production of the more recent theme, but as a transmission from the ancient period of the language, for it answers to the feminine Sanskrit nominative *charanti* (§. 137.), and to Lithuanian forms like *sukanti*, "the turning," for which a theme *sukantin* is nowise admissible. In Latin, bases in *i* or *i*, originally feminine, must have arisen from adjective bases terminating with a consonant, thus *FERENTI* from *FERENT* (compare §. 119 *genitri*-*c-s*) and this feminine *i*, as the case in Lithuanian, as well with the participles (see p. 174, Note) as

[G Ed p 387] with the adjective bases in *u* (p 363), has in some cases no longer remembered its original destination, and been imparted to the other genders. Hence the ablatives in *i* (for *i-d*), genitive plural in *i-um*, neuter plural in *ia* (*ferenti(d)*, *ferenti-um*, *ferenti-a*), and hence is explained, what must otherwise appear very surprising, that the

participles, when standing as substantives, freely take this *z*, which is introduced into them from the feminine adjective (*infante sapiente*)

"Remark —In the *yu* of *lepantyu* the Old High German feminine of *lepantēr*, I recognise the regular defining element as above in *plintyu*, answering to the masculine *plintēr*. On account of the participial feminines in *yu* therefore it is not requisite to presuppose masculines in *yēr*, according to the analogy of *midyēr midyu midyaz* partly as *lepentēr* and *lepantaz*, incline, in none of their cases, to the declension of *midyēr midyaz* and also as the derivative indefinite base in *on* has sprung from *ALPANTA* and not from *KLPANTYA* therefore in *lepanto* (=Gothic *gibanda*) *f n lepanta* (=Gothic *gibandō*). Thus only is peculiar to the Old High German participle present, in relation to other adjectives that in its uninflected adverbial state it retains the defining pronominal base *YA* in its contraction to *z*, therefore *lepantz* "giving," not *lepant*, like *plint*. It is however, to be observed, that there is far more frequent occasion to use this form divested of case terminations in the participle present, than in all other adjectives, as the definite form in *nds* in Gothic, in the nominative singular masculine corresponds to it and as it may be assumed that here the *z* supplies the place of the case termination which has been laid aside, so that it is very often arbitrary whether the definite form of the participle or the uninflected form in *z* be given. So in Grimm's hymns (II 2) *sustollens* is rendered by the uninflected *uspurrentz* and *baptizans* by *taufantēr* although the reverse might just as well occur or both participles might stand in the same form whether that of the nominative or adverbial. As regards the Old Saxon forms mentioned by Grimm namely *slāpandyes* or *slāpandeas* *dormientis gnornondyē mærentes buandyum*, "habitantibus" they should in my opinion be rather adduced in

proof of the proposition, that the participle present has, in the dialect mentioned, preserved the defining element more truly than other adjectives; and that those forms have maintained themselves in the degree of the Gothic

[G Ed p 388] forms like *manvya*, mentioned at p 362, than that a theme in *ya* belonged to the Old High German participle present before its conjunction with the pronominal syllable."

#### DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

291. The comparative is expressed in Sanskrit by the suffix *tara*, feminine *tarā*, and the superlative by *tama*, feminine *tamā*, which are added to the common masculine and neuter theme of the positive, e g. *punya-tara*, *punya-tama*, from *punya*, "pure", *śuchi-tara*, *śuchi-tama*, from *śuchi*, "clean", *balavat-tara*, *balavat-tama*, from *balavat*, "strong" In the Zend, through a perversion of the language *𐬔𐬀𐬌* *tara* and *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌* *tēma* unite themselves with (in place of the theme) the nominative singular masculine, e g *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬔𐬀* *huskótara* (Vend S p 383) from *huska*, nominative masculine *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌* *hushō*, "dry", *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌* *špēntōtēma* from *špēnta*, "holy", *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬔𐬀* *vērēthrazantēma* (Vend S p 43) from *vērēthrazant*, nom. *vērēthrazan*, "victorious" (literally, "Vritra-slaying")<sup>1</sup> According to my opinion *𐬔𐬀𐬌* *tara* owes

<sup>1</sup> The participle present *zant*, the nominative of which I recognise in *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌* *vērēthra-zan*, rests on the analogy of the frequently-occurring *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬀* *upa-zōt*, "let him strike", since, in fact, the root *zan* (Sanskrit *हन्* *han*) suppresses its final vowel, and has treated the *a* which remains according to the analogy of the conjugation *𐬀* of the first and sixth class (see p 104) The Sanskrit radical *हन्* *han*, "slaying," which appears in *वृत्रहन्* *Vritra-han*, "Vritra slaying," and similar compounds, has, in Zend, taken the form *jan*, the nominative of which is *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬀* *áo* (Vend S p 43),

its origin to the root  $\pi$  *tri* (*tar* § 1) to [G Ed p 389] step beyond to place beyond (e g over a river) hence also the substantive *tara* a float In the Latin, as Lasch has acutely remarked, with this root are connected the preposition *trans* and also *terminus* as that which is overstepped and probably also *tra* in *in tra re penetra re* The superlative suffix I derive with Grimm (III 583) from that of the comparative although I assume no theoretic necessity that the superlative must have been developed through the degree of the comparative But *tama*, as a primitive presents no satisfactory etymology I formerly thought of the base  $\pi$  *tan* to extend whence also *τατος* could be explained but then  $\pi$  *tama* would be no regular formation and I now prefer recognising in it an abbreviation of *tarama* partly because the superlative suffix इष्ट *ishtha* may be satisfactorily considered as derived from its comparative *iyas* through the suffix *tha* which in the Greek, is contained in the form of *το* as well in *ιστος* as in *τατος* for *ταπος* or *ταποτος* In this manner therefore is formed *τατος* and  $\pi$  *tama* *s* they both contain the same primitive abbreviated in a similar manner but have taken a different derivative suffix as in  $\pi$  *cm* *τος* contrasted with पञ्चम *panchama* the fifth the vowel however is more truly retained in the derivative *τατος* than in its base *τεπος* In Latin  $\pi$  *tama* *s* has become *timus* (*optimus intimus extimus ultimus*) and by the exchange of the *t* with *s* which is more usual in Greek than in Latin *simus* hence

p 43) and is analogous to the Sanskrit *panthas* from *panthan* mentioned at p 308 More usually however *ao* in Zend nominatives stands in the place of the Sanskrit *an* of the suffix *tant* and *tans* so that in Zend the sign of the nominative has taken the place of the Indian *n* the said sign being *o* for *s* according to § 56 In  $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀}$  *ādo* from  $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀}$  *āns* the Zend *o* may also be looked upon as belonging to the base (comp Burnouf's *Yaena* Notes p cxxviii &c)

*maximus* (*mac-sinus*) for *mag-sinus* However, the *sinus* is generally preceded by the syllable *is*, which we will hereafter explain.

292. As in comparatives a relation between two, and in [G Ed p 390] superlatives a relation between many, lies at the bottom, it is natural that their suffixes should also be transferred to other words, whose chief notion is individualized through that of duality or plurality thus they appear in pronouns, and कतरस् *katara-s* is "which of two persons?" and कतमस् *katama-s*, "which of more than two persons?" एकतरस् *êkataras* is "one of two persons," and êkalama-s, "one of more than two" It is hardly necessary to call attention to similar forms in Greek, as πότρυς (for κότρυς), êκάτρυς. In êκαστος the superlative suffix (στος for ιστος) presents a different modification from that in êkalama-s, and expresses "the one of two persons," instead of "the one of many persons." In Latin and German, indeed, the suffix *tara* is not in use in genuine comparatives, but has maintained itself in pronouns in Latin in the form of *TERU* (*ter, teru-m*), and in Gothic in that of *THARA*, hence *uter, neuter, alter*, Gothic, *hva-thar*,\* "which of two persons?" Old High German, [G Ed p 391] *huedar*, which has remained to us in the adverb *weder*, as an abbreviation of the Middle High Ger-

\* The Gothic resembles the Latin in withdrawing the sign of the nominative from its masculine bases in *ra*, as the latter does from its corresponding bases in *ru* Hence, above, *hvathar* for *hvathar(a)s*, as *alter* for *alterus*, so also *vair*, "man," = Latin *vir* for *vu-u-s* This suppression has, however, not extended itself universally in both languages In the Gothic, as it appears, the *s* is protected by the two preceding consonants, hence *akrs*, "a field" (comp Grimm, p 599), still the adjective nominatives *gaur s*, "mournful" (theme *Gaura*, comp Sanskrit शृङ्गा *ghôra*, "terrible"), and *svêrs*, "honoured," occur, where this cause is wanting, where, however, the preceding long vowel and the diphthong *au* may have operated In *vair*, indeed, a diphthong precedes, but the *a* is here first introduced through the euphonic law 82 If, in Latin, in adjective bases in *ri*, only the masculine has predominantly given up the *s*, with the preceding

man combined with a particle of negation *neueder* *Antar* also our *anderer*, belongs here and answers to the Sanskrit अन्तरम् *antara s* whose initial syllable is the same which in अन्य *anya alius* has united itself with the relative base *y ya*. From this अन्य *anya* comes *anyatara* *alter*. If however अन्तर *antara* means in general the other the comparative suffix is here intended to denote the person following after passing over this thing, so is also the Latin *ceterus* to be considered, from *ce* as demonstrative base (compare *ci s ci-tra*) and so also in Sanskrit, *itara*, the other comes from the demonstrative base *i* as in Latin the adverb *iterum* from the same base \*. In our German also *wieder* is the comparative suffix and the whole rests perhaps on a pre-existing Old High German word *hwa dar* or *hwyadar*, with a change of the interrogative meaning into the demonstrative as in *weder ent weder*. The *wie* in *wieder* therefore should be regarded as p 370 *die* in *dieser* and herein we may refer to the Isidoric *dhea sa*.

293 In prepositions also it cannot be surprising if one finds them invested with a comparative or superlative suffix or if some of them occur merely with a comparative termination. Far at the bottom of all genuine prepositions

preceding *i* while *e g* the feminine *acris* might have permitted its *is* to have been removed, just as well as the masculine, I can find the reason of this firm adherence of the feminine to the termination *is* only in the circumstance that the vowel *i* particularly agrees with that gender, as it is in Sanskrit (although long) according to § 119, the true vowel of formation for the feminine base. In Gothic, the suppression of the nominative sign *s* is universal in bases in *sa* and *si* in order that as the final vowel of the base is suppressed, two *s* should not meet at the end of the word, hence *e g* the nominative *drus* 'a fall' from *DRUSA garuns*, 'a market' from *GARUNSI* †.

\* I have traced back the comparative nature of this adverb which Voss derives from *iter* 'the journey' for the first time in my Review of Forster's Sanskrit Grammar in the *Heidelb Jahrb* 1818 i p 479

at least in their original sense, there exists a relation between [G Ed. p 392] two opposite directions thus, "over," "from," "before," "to," have the relations "under," "in," "towards," "from," as their counter-poles and points of comparison, as the right is opposed to the left, and is always expressed in Latin, also, with the comparative suffix, *dexter* (दक्षिण *dakshina*), *sinister*. As, however, the comparative nature of these formations is no longer recognised in the present condition of the Latin, the suffix *ter* admits of the further addition of the customary *ior* (*dexterior*, *sinisterior*, like *exterior*, *interior*); while the superlative *timus* has affixed itself to the core of the word (*dextimus* or *-tumus*, *sinistimus*). The prepositions which, in Latin, contain a comparative suffix, are *inter*, *præter*, *propter*, the adverbially-used *subter*, and probably, also, *obiter* (compare *audacter*, *pariter*) \* To *inter* answers the Sanskrit अन्तर *antar*, "among," "between", for which, however, a primitive *an* is wanting, as in Sanskrit the relation "in" is always expressed by the locative Notwithstanding this, *antar*, in regard to its suffix, is an analogous word to मन्तर *prâtar*, "in the morning," from the preposition [G Ed p 393] *pra*, "before,"† with a lengthened *a*, as in the

\* I was of opinion, when I first treated this subject (Heidelb Jahrb 1818 p 480), that *ob-i-ter* must be so divided, and *i* looked upon as the vowel of conjunction As, however, the preposition *ob* is connected with the Sanskrit अभि *abhi*, "to," "towards," the division *obi-ter* might also be made, and the original form of the preposition recognised in *obi* observe the Sanskrit derivative अभितस् *abhi-tas*, "near," from *abhi* with the suffix *tas* The common idea, however, that *obiter* is compounded of *ob* and *itei* cannot entirely be disproved, partly as then *obiter* would be a similar compound to *obviam*

† Comp *nî*, *parî*, *prâtî*, for *nî*, &c in certain compounds Formations which do not quite follow the usual track, and are rendered intelligible by numerous analogies, are nevertheless frequently misunderstood by the Indian Grammarians Thus Wilson, according to native authorities, derives अन्तर *antar* from *anta*, "end," with *îâ*, "to arrive at," and the analogous

Greek  $\pi\rho\omega\tau$  from  $\pi\rho\omicron$  For the relation under the Sanskrit has the preposition  $\text{अधस्}$  *adhas* which I have elsewhere explained as coming from the demonstrative base  $\text{अ०}$  from which also come  $\text{अधर}$  *a dhara* and  $\text{अधम}$  *a dhama* the under one or the most under to which *inferus* and *infimus* are akin as *fumus* to  $\text{धूमस्}$  *dhuma s* smoke and with a nasal prefixed as in  $\text{अप्थि}$  in relation to  $\text{अभि}$  *abhi* and in  $\text{अम्भो}$  *ambo* answering to  $\text{उम्भी}$  *ubhāu* Old Slavonic *oba* The suffixes  $\text{धर}$  *dhara* and  $\text{धम}$  *dhama* are in my opinion only slightly-corrupted forms of the *tara* and *tama* mentioned in § 291 as also in  $\text{प्रथम}$  *prathama* the first in from *pro* before" the *T* sound of the suffix is somewhat differently transposed The suffix *adhas* of *odhas* beneath," however has exactly the same relation to *tas* in  $\text{अतस्}$  *atas* from here as *dhara dhama* have to *tara tama* and therefore *odhas* as a modification of *atas* is in respect to its suffix a cognate form of *subtus intus* The usual intention of the suffix  $\text{तस्}$  *tas* like that of the Latin *tus* is to express distance from a place In this also the Greek  $\theta\epsilon\iota$  (from  $\theta\epsilon\varsigma$  comp § 217) corresponds with it which in regard to its *T* sound rests on the form  $\text{ध्वस्}$  *dhvos* in  $\text{अध्वस्}$  *adhvos* (§ 16) as the latter also serves as the pattern of the Old Slavonic suffix *dā* which only occurs in pronouns and expresses the same relation as  $\text{तस्}$  *tas*  $\theta\epsilon\iota$  *tus* e g  $\text{отъ}$  *ōdu* hence" \*  $\text{отъ}$  *ōdu* thence The form *dā* however, corresponds to the euphonic alteration which a final *as* in the Sanskrit must suffer before [G Ed p 394] sonant letters (§ 23) viz that into  $\theta$  (see § 250 f) which in Zend has become fixed (§ 26<sup>b</sup>)

analogous word *pratar* from *pra*, with *at* to go A relation, nevertheless between *anta* 'end and *antar*, among cannot perhaps be denied as they agree in the idea of room They are however, if they are related sister-forms, and the latter is not an offshoot of the former

\* The demonstrative base *OIO* answers remarkably to the Zend  $\text{आ०}$  *ata* with *o* for *a* according to § 230 (a)



"Remark Dobrowsky p. 451 gives *ûdû* as the full form of the suffix, just as he also lays down a suffix *ûdye*, which forms adverbs of place, as *kûdye*, "where?" *onûdye*, "there." As, however, the definitive pronoun, which has been treated of at p. 353, &c., exists in these two adverbs, *ûdû*, *ûdye*, and forms, with *sche*, *ûdûsche*, *ûdyesche*, for *yûdû*, &c; and as this pronoun is, in general, so frequently compounded with other adverbs, there is every reason to assume that it is also contained in *ovo-ûdû*, *ono-ûdû*, *on'-ûdye*, *t'-ûdye*, and others. But how is the *û* itself in *u-dû*, *yû-dye*, to be explained? I cannot speak with confidence on this point, but as, according to §. 255 (g), in the last element of the diphthong *û* a vocalised nasal is sometimes recognised, *yudû*, *yûdye*, might be regarded as corruptions of *yondû*, *yondye*, and, in respect to their nasal, be compared with the Latin *inde*, *unde*, from *I, U*. *Yûdye*, *yûdyû*, might also have proceeded from the feminine accusative *yû*, which would again conduct us to a nasal (§ 266.) this accusative would then stand as theme to the derivative adverb, as our preposition *hinter*, Old High German *hinter*, has arisen from *hin*, a petrified accusative, on which the Gothic *hina-dag*, "this day," "to day," throws light. Before the suffix *dye*, however, elder form *de*, occur also the pronouns in a simple form, as *gdye*, "where?" (more anciently *kde*, with the final vowel of the base *KO* suppressed), *zdye* (older *sde*), "here", *îdyesche*, "where" (relative). As *e* (ε), according to § 255 (b), frequently stands as the corruption of an older *i*, I recognise in the suffix *de* the Sanskrit *धि dhî*, from *अधि adhi*, "over," "upon" "towards," (from the demonstrative base *a*), which, in Greek, is far more widely diffused in the form of *θι* (πόθι, ἄλλοθι)"

294 In German, even more than in Latin, the prepositions shew themselves inclined to combine with the comparative suffix. To the Sanskrit *अन्तर antar*, Latin *inter*, mentioned above (at p. 392, G ed), corresponds our *unter*, Gothic

*undar* with *u* for the old *a* according to § 66 \* If however the in my opinion incontrovertible original identity of the latter with the two former is recognised [G Ed p 39.] one must not, with Grimm (III 260) derive *undar* from the preposition *und* as far as &c., by a suffix *ar* and so again divide the *dar* for *undar*† as transmitted from an ancient period of the language was already formed before the existence of a German dialect and the abovementioned preposition has only to dispose itself according to the relations of sound mentioned in §§ 66 91 The matter is different with the Old High German *afstar* "after" for the primitive language, or languages transmit to us only *अप अपो* "from", to which in the spirit of *अन्तर* *antar* *inter* *subter* &c the old comparative suffix has first united itself upon German ground In Gothic *afstra* means "again" which I look upon as an abbreviation of *afstara* as in Latin *extra intra contra* and others, as feminine adjectives from *extera* &c In regard to the termination however *afstra* and similar forms in *tra thra* appear to me as datives i.e. original instrumentals (§ 160), as also in the Sanskrit, this case occurs as an adverb e.g. in *अन्तरैः antareḥ* "between" Perhaps also the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs in *tra* although they have a locative meaning like *यत्र yatra* "where" are to be regarded as instrumental forms according to the principle of the Zend language (§ 158) and of the gerund in *या ya* (Gramm Crit § 633 Rem) so that their *tra* would be to be derived from *तरा tarā* compare forms like *मनुष्या manushya trā inter homines* (Gramm Crit

Regarding *dar* and *tar* for *thar*, see § 91

† Grimm however also at II 121 &c., divides *broth ar*, *fat ar* ( "brother father " ) although the many analogous words denoting relationship in the German and the cognate languages clearly prove the *T* sound to belong to the derivative suffix (see Gramm Crit § 178 Rem)

§. 252. suff. *ti* ð). As *aftra* is related to *afstar*, so is the Gothic *vitlra*, "against," to the Old High German *widan*, our *wider*, the primitive of which is supplied by the Sanskrit through its

[G. Ed p. 396] inseparable preposition *fā* *ti*, which expresses separation, distraction, e.g. in *visrip*, "to go from one another," "to disperse." Exactly similar is the Sanskrit *fā* *m*, to which I was the first to prove the meaning "below" to belong,\* and whence comes the adjective *āṭi* *na* *hā*, "low" (Gramm. Crit §. 111), the base of our *nider*, Old High Ger-

[G. Ed p 397] *man* *ni*-*dar*.† From *hin*-*dar*, Old High German *hin*-*tar*, comes our *hin*-*ter* which has already been discussed (p 391, G. ed. compare Grimm III 177. c) In the Old High German *sun*-*dar*, Gothic *sun*-*di* ð, "seorsim," afterwards a preposition, our *sondern*, *dar* is, in like manner, clearly the comparative suffix, and the base appears to me, in spite of the difference of signi-

\* It is usual to attribute to it the meaning "in," "into," which cannot in any way be supported.

† Grimm assents to my opinion, which has been already expressed in another place, regarding the relationship of *fā* *m* and *nidar* (III 258, 259) he wishes, however, to divide thus *nid*-*ar*, and to suppose a Gothic verb *nithan*, *nath*, *nēthun*, to which the Old High German *gnāda* (our *Gnade*) may belong. Does, however, *gi*-*nāda* really signify *humilitas*? It appears that only the meaning *gratia* can be proved to belong to it, and this is also given by Grimm, I 617 and II 235 *gratia*, *humantitas*, where he divides *hi*-*nā*-*da*, which appears to me correct, and according to which *nā* would be the root, and *da* the derivative suffix, as in the etymologically clean *hi*-*uā*-*da*, "afflatus," to which the Sanskrit gives *वा* *ua*, "to blow," as root, the Gothic gives *vô* (§ 69) (*vaia*, *vaub*) To *gi*-*nā*-*da*, indeed, the Sanskrit supplies no root *nā*, but perhaps *nam*, "to bend oneself," the *m* of which, according to the laws of euphony, is suppressed before *t*, which does not produce Guna, as *nata*, "bent," *nati*, "bending," with the preposition *sam*, *san*-*ndti*, which Wilson explains by "reverence," "obeisance," "reverential salutation" As the Gothic inseparable preposition *ga*, Old High German *gi* or *hi*, is, as Grimm first acutely remarked, identical with the Sanskrit *sam*, *gi*-*nā*-*da* has much the same formation with *san*-*na*-*ti* it would, however, still better agree with the feminine passive

fiction related to the Sanskrit सम् *sam* with (compare Gothic *samath* "together with" Old High German *samant*) and the *u* therefore is from *a* according to § 66. The Latin *contra* however is nearly just as much opposed in meaning to its primitive *cum* and *us cum* (compare *सुम्*) belongs in like manner to सम् *sam* so *sundar* *sundrō* and *contra* would be in a double respect sister forms. Observe also the Gothic *samath* Old High German *samant*, "together with" the latter answers surprisingly to the Sanskrit सम् *samanta* (from *sam + anta* an end) the ablative of which, *samantā* is also the adverb *samantatas* mean "everywhere." Perhaps, too in all other Old High German adverbs in *ut* (Grimm III 211) the *ant* *anta* is contained for the meaning "end" cannot be unexpected in adverbs of place and time and like *Mitte*, "mid."

—

possessive participle *san na ti*. Be that as it may, so much is certain that there is no necessity for a hypothetical Gothic base *nith* or *nith* either for the substantive *gi nada* or for the preposition *ni 're* as they can be fully set at rest by the existence of a Sanskrit primitive *सन्ति* below and the comparative suffix *dar*, which frequently occurs in prepositions. And as the circumstance that genuine original prepositions never come from verbs, but are connected with pronouns. I must with regard to its etymology step back every veil from our *midar*. Grimm wishes also to divide the Gothic preposition *ist* *ist* Old High German *ist dar*, into *ist* *ra* *ist-ar* and to find their base in the Anglo-Saxon preposition *wid*, English *with* Old Slavonic *wid*, Old Norman *with* Swedish *vid* Danish *ved* which mean "with" and according to appearance, are wanting in the Gothic and High German. If, however one considers the easy and frequent interchange of *r* and *m* (घारि *idri* "water," = *mare* *β*, or = मत्स *mrilas* *mortuus*) one would rather recognise, in the above prepositions, dialectic variations of sound from the Gothic *nith* which is of the same import with them (= the *seni* *sen* *mat*), and which, in most of the dialects mentioned maintains itself equally with the other forms, as it often occurs in the history of languages that the true form of a word is equally preserved with a corruption of it.

(compare *inmitten*, "in the midst") and *Anfang*, "beginning," it attaches itself first to the prepositional ideas therefore *hinont*, "this side," *enont*, "that side," would be the same as "at this end," "at that end." With regard to the comparative forms there is, further, the Old High German *for-dar*, *fur-dir* ("porro," "amplius"), our *fur-der* to be mentioned, whence *der vordere*, *vorderste*

[G Ed. p 398] "Remark 1 As we have endeavoured above to explain the Gothic *af-tra* and *vithra* as datives, I believe I can with still more confidence present the forms in *thiô* or *tarô* as remarkable remains of ablatives Their meaning corresponds most exactly to that of the Sanskrit ablative, which expresses the withdrawing from a place, and to that of the Greek adverbs in *θεν*, thus *hva-thrô*, "whence?" *tha-thrô*, "thence," *yam-thrô*, "hence," *alya-thrô*, "from another quarter," *inna-thiô*, "from within," *uta-thiô*, "from without," *af-tarô*, "from behind," *dala-thiô*, "from under," and some others, but only from pronouns, and, what is nearly the same, prepositions I might, therefore, derive *dalathiô*, not from *dal*, "a valley," but suppose a connection with the Sanskrit अधर *adhara*, "the under person," with aphæresis of the *a* and the very common exchange of the *r* with *l* (§ 20) Perhaps, however, on the contrary, *thal* is so named from the notion of the part below. As to the ablative forms in *tarô*, *thrô*, the *ô* corresponds to the Sanskrit *ât* (§ 179), with *ô*, according to rule, for *ait* *â* (§. 69), and apocope of the *t*, so that *ô* has the same relation to the to-be-presupposed *ôt* that in Greek *οὔτω* has to *οὔτως*, from *οὔτωτ* (§ 183 Note \* p 201) Many other Gothic adverbs in *ô*, as *sintemô*, "always," *snumundô*, "hastily," *spiantô*, "suddenly," *thridyô*, "thurdly," &c., might then, although an ablative meaning does not appear more plainly in them than in the Latin *perpetuo*, *cito*, *subito*, *tertio*, and others, be rather considered as ablatives than as neuter accusatives of indefinite (Grimm's weak) forms, so that *thridyô* would

answer to the Sanskrit ablative *trityāṃ* while the common Gothic declension extends the ordinal bases in *a* by an unorganic *n* thus *THRIDYAN* nom *thridya*. It must be further observed that all unorganic adjective bases in *an* are, in general only used where the adjective is rendered definite through a pronoun preceding it that therefore the forms in *ð* which pass for adverbial, are, for the very reason that no pronoun precedes them better assigned to the definite (strong) declension than to the indefinite, especially as most of them are only remains of an old adjective, which is no longer preserved in other cases and according to their formation belong to a period where the indefinite adjective declension had not yet received the unorganic addition of *nn* *n*. As to the translation of *τοὐναντίον* 2 Cor 11 7 by *thata andaneithð* here of course *andaneithð* is the neuter accusative, but the inducement for using the indefinite form is supplied by the article and *τοὐναντίον* could not be otherwise literally rendered. The case may be similar with 2 Cor 11 17 where Castiglione takes *thata andairthð* for the [G Ed p 399] nominative but Grimm for the adverbial accusative as it would else be an unsuitable imitation of the Greek text where *το* does not belong to *αὐτίκα* but to *εὐφρον*. In my opinion however it can in no case be inferred from these passages that the adverbs in *ð* without an article preceding them belong to the same category. Moreover also *andaneithð* and *andairthð* do not occur by themselves alone adverbially. As then *thrð* has shewn itself to us to be an abbreviation of *thrott* it is a question whether the suppression of the *t* by a universal law of sound was requisite as in Greek and in the Prakrit all *T* sounds are rejected from the end of words or changed into *Σ*. It is certain that the *T* sounds (*t th, d*) which in the actual condition of the Gothic are finals as far as we can follow their etymology had originally a vowel after them, so that

they are final sounds of a second generation, comparable in that respect to the Slavonic final consonants (§. 255. *l*). This holds good, for example, with regard to *th*, *d*, in the 3d person singular and plural, and the 2d person plural = Sanskrit ति *ti*, अन्ति *anti*, थ *tha* or ता *ta*; and I explain the *th* or *d*, which, in pronominal bases, expresses direction to a place, as coming from the Sanskrit suffix थ *dha* (ह *ha*), which, in like manner, in pronouns expresses the locative relation. The passing over from the locative relation to the accusative, expressing the direction whither, cannot be surprising, as, even in Sanskrit, the common locative adverbs in *tra*, and the ablatives in *tas*, occur also with accusative meaning, *i. e.* expressing the direction to a place (see *tatra* in my Glossary) The Sanskrit suffix थ *dha* appears, in common language, abbreviated to *ha*, and is found, indeed, only in *i-ha*, “here,” from the pronominal base *i* and स *sa*-*ha*—in the Vedic dialect and Zend *sa-dha* which I derive from the pronominal base *sa*. It ought, according to its origin, and consistently with the usual destination of the suffix *dha*, to mean “here or there” it has, however, become a preposition, which expresses “with.” The adverb स *iha*, “here,” is, in Zend, स॒॒॒॒॒॒ *idha*,\* and fre-

[G. Ed p 400] quently occurs in combination with स॒॒॒ *na*, “not”, so that स॒॒॒॒॒॒ *naédha*† means “nor,” answering to स॒॒॒॒ *nót*, “neither” (literally “not it,” from *na + it*, § 33) From स॒॒॒ *ava* and स॒॒॒॒ *aéla*, “this” (*mas*), comes स॒॒॒॒॒ *ava*

\* Vend Sâde, p 368 several times स॒॒॒॒॒॒॒॒॒॒॒॒ *iman idha vachô framrava*, “*hæc hic verba enuntia*,” which Anquetil translates by “*en prononçant bien ces paroles*” In the same page also occurs repeatedly स॒॒॒ *adha*, with the same meaning, from the demonstrative base *a*, as in the Vêda’s अथ *adha* (Rosen’s Sp p 10), without perceptible meaning

† *a + i* makes *é*, according to § 2, and from *nédha* is formed, by § 28, *naédha*

*avadha* and *𐬀𐬕𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀* *alta dha* (Vend S p 164) To the Zend Vedic suffix *dha* corresponds most exactly the Greek *θα*, in *ἐῖθα* and *εἰταῦ-θα* here Perhaps *ἐνθα* and *𐬀𐬕𐬀* *dha*, *इह iha* are with regard to their base identical *ἐῖθα* therefore, is for *ἔνθα* from *ἔθα* (comp *in, inde*), as nasals are easily prefixed to another consonant and thus *ἀμφί* answers to *अभि abhi* *ἄμφω* to *उभौ ubhāu* Old Slavonic *oba* but *avθα* in the triple compound *εἰ-τ-αῦθα* is completely the Zend *𐬀𐬕𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬀* *atadha* whose theme *ava* has been contracted in the Greek to *av* (compare *αὐ θί* and *av-τος*, the latter being combined with the article) but in the Old Slavonic it is more correctly preserved in the form of *OF O \** To the word *इहस ihasya* of this place which is derived from *इह iha* through the suffix *स त्या* corresponds the Greek *εἰθασίος* with *σ* from *τ* compare, with regard to the suffix the Latin *propitius* from *prope*, and, in the Gothic, *frama thya* a foreigner through which the preposition *fram* shews itself to be an abbreviation of *frama* As in the Sanskrit the suffix *स त्या* belongs only to local adverbs and prepositions so might also the Gothic *ni thys* 'cousin (for *ni thys* § 135) as *propinquus* or one who stands somewhat lower in relationship than a brother &c † be derived from the [G Ed p 401]

\* Before my acquaintance with the Zend and deeper examination of the Slavonic, I believed I could make out the Greek base *av* to agree with the Sanskrit *amu* 'ille' by casting out the *m* (as *ko pos* with *ku māra*) now, however *अय ata* and *OF O* have clearly nearer claims to tal e the Greek forms between them

† Terms of relation ship often express the relation of which they are the representatives very remotely but ingeniously Thus *नप्तृ* *naptri* a grandson is I have no doubt compounded of *na* 'not' and *pitri* father and 'not father' is regarded as a possessive compound, 'not having as father' its relation to the grandfather who is not the father of the grandson In Latin it would be difficult to find the etymology of *nepos* (*nepot*)—and the same may be said of our word *neffe*—without the aid of the word *later*, which is fully preserved from the Sanskrit In the



ancient preposition *ni*, mentioned at p 382, from which, in Sanskrit, *niṭya* actually comes, but differently related, and with a signification answering less to the meaning of the preposition, namely, *sempiternus*. In consideration of the aspirates in Greek being easily interchanged, and, *e.g.* in the Doric, ὈPNIX is said for ὈPNIO, one may also recognise in the syllable *χο*, in forms like *παντα-χό-θεν*, *παντα-χό-σε*, *πολλαχόσε*, and others, a cognate form of the suffix *θα*, *dha*, or of the corrupted *ἥ ha* (comp. § 23) At the bottom of these forms lies, in my opinion, as the theme, the plural neuter, which need not be wondered at, as *πάντα* and *πολλά* are also used as first members of compounds (*πολλά-σημος*, *παντά-μορφος*). *Πανταχο* might, in the identity of its suffix with *θα*, *dha*, or *ha*, mean "everywhere", whence may then be said *πανταχό-σε*, "from everywhere," &c, as we combine our locative adverbs *wo* and *da* with *her* and *hin* (*woher*, *wohin*), and in Greek, also, ἐκκίθι, ἐκείσε, ἐκείθεν, which might literally mean *in illic*, *versus illic*, *ab illic*, as ἐκκί is a local adverb Forms in *χο*, however, are in a measure raised to themes capable of declension, though only for adverbs, and develop, also, case-forms, as *πανταχοῦ*, *πανταχοῖ* (old locative and dative), *πανταχῇ* The addition of new suffixes or terminations to those already existing, but which are obsolete, appears to me assuredly more natural than, as Buttmann supposes, the introduction of an unmeaning *αχ* or even *αχο*, in which case we should have to divide *παντ-αχό-θεν*, &c. But as the *χο* under discussion has arisen from *θα*, *dha*, I think I recognise in the *χι* of ἥχι a corruption of the suffix *θι*, from *ἥ dha*, in which respect might be compared ἄγχι, as a sister form to

meaning of *Neffe* the negation of the relationship of father points to the uncle The Indian Grammarians, according to Wilson, see in *naptri* the negation, but not the father, but the root *pat*, "to fall," and a Unâdi suffix *tri*

अधि *adhi* to towards with *a* nasal introduced As a third form in which the Vedic Zend suffix *dha* appears in Greek I notice *σε* with *σ* for *θ* *υ* *dhi* as *μεσος* from *मध्य* *madhya* midst the *y* of which has assimilated itself in the form *μεσος*, to the *σ* The suffix *σε* however in that it is altered from its original intention to denote rest in a place to the expression of motion to a place answers to the Gothic *th* or *d* whence we set out in this examination in forms like *hith* πο-σε, whither? also *hith*—John xiii 3 *hith* *gaggis* ποῦ υπα γεις—*gain-d* ἐκὶ σε *alya* *th* ἄλλο σε To the Zend *idha* Greek *ἐνθα* corresponds *ith* which however contrary to the original intention of the form does not mean thither but is used as a conjunction— but if then (1 Cor vii 7) To this class also belongs *ath* which only occurs in combination with *than*—*ath* *than* but like *ith*-*than* and it has [G Ed p 402] the Vedic Zend *a dha* as prototype (§ 399) *I had* in combination with the relative particle *ei* which is probably connected with *या* has preserved the original locative meaning together with the accusative, and *thad-ei* may be cited as where and whither The *d* in these forms answering to the Greek *θ* agrees with the rule for the transmutation of sounds (§ 87) and it is to be observed that medials at the end of a word freely pass into aspirates—compare *bauth* *bu dum* (§ 91)—so that the Gothic *T* sound of the suffix under discussion after it has in one direction diverged from the Greek, has in another again approached it

“Remark 2—As we have above recognised ablatives in the formations in *thrō* *tarō* so we find in this comparative suffix also a remnant of the Sanskrit locative in which however as in the adverbs in *th* *d* the expression of repose in a place is changed into that of motion to a place—in *hidré*\* Luther Mark xi 3 Luke xiv 21 *hva dré* whither? John vii 35 On the other hand *gaindré* *ic*

tually occurs with a locative meaning, *thareī leik, γαῖνδιέ γαῖσανδ σικ αράνς*, 'ὅπου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκκί συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί.' Compare these forms with the Sanskrit, as, *adharī*, "in the lower," and the Lithuanian *wilkė* (§ 197.). That, however, the Gothic *ē*, which in the genitive plural masculine and neuter answers to the Sanskrit अद् *ā* (§ 69), moreover corresponds to ए *ē*, is proved by preterites like *nēmum*, 'we took,' answering to the singular *nam*, as, in Sanskrit, नेमि *nēmima*, 'we bent ourselves,' answers to ननम *nanama* or ननमि *nanāma*, 'I bent myself'."

295 The superlative suffix तम *tama* occurs in the Gothic also in the form of *TUMAN*, nominative *tuma*, or, with *d* for *t* in prepositional derivations, either simply or in combination with the common superlative suffix *ISTA*, thus, *af-tuma*, "posterus," *af-tumists*, "postremus," *hū-dumists*, "extremus" If one considers the Indian suffix तम *tama*, to have suffered apocope of the *a*—as in Latin, also, *timus* appears abbreviated to *tim* in adverbs like *virī-tim*, *calerva-tim*, which I have already, in another place (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818 p. 480), explained, together with forms like *legi-timus*, as superlatives—one may look for that *tam* in the Gothic cor-

[G Ed p. 403] rupted to *tana*, after the analogy of the accusative masculine of pronouns, like *tha-na* = तम् *tam*, τόν, *hva-na* = कम् *ka-m*, "whom?", and accordingly regard the prepositional derivations in *tana*, *dana*, as superlative forms, thus, Gothic *af-tana*, "behind", *hindana*, πέραν, Old High German *ni-dana*, "under" (compare our *hie-neden*, "here below" As, however, in Old High German there exist, also, formations in *ana* without a preceding *t* sound (Grimm III. 203, &c), it is a question whether *innana* "within," *ūzana* "abroad," *forana* shortened to *fora* "from the beginning," *ferrana* "πρόρρωθεν," *rūmana* "from a distance," *hōhana* "ὠψόθεν," *hermina* "οἰκοθεν," have lost a *t* or a *d* preceding the *a*, or if they are formed after those in *tana*, *dana*, in the notion that the whole of the suffix consists merely of *ana*; or, finally, whether they rest on some other principle

The preposition *obar* over Gothic *ufar* which answers to the Sanskrit उपरि *upari* Greek *υπερ*, has in the same manner an adverb *obana* above corresponding to it

296 In the Saanskrit the appellations of the quarters of the heavens come from prepositions in combination with the root अञ्च *anch* to go, thus the east is denoted as that which is before by प्राञ्च *prānch* from प्रा *pra* before the west as that which is over against it by प्रत्यञ्च *pratyanch* from प्रति *prati* opposite the south as 'that below' by अदञ्च *adānch* from अय *ava* below, and its opposite pole, the north as that above is called उदञ्च *udānch* from उ *ut* up. Now it is remarkable that in German the names of the quarters of the world shew themselves through their terminations. Old High German *tar* and *tana* or as they so frequently occur in prepositions *dar* *dana* to be derivations from prepositions though the nature of their origin has become obscure. The custom of the language disposes of the forms in *r* and *na* in such a manner, that the former expresses the direction whither (Grimm III 205) the latter the direction whence which however was not perhaps the original intention of the terminations both which seem adapted to express the same direction the former comparatively with a glance at [G Ed p 404] that which is opposite the latter superlatively in relation to all the quarters of the globe as p 376 एकतरा *ēkatara* one of two persons but एकतम *ēkatama* one of many persons. The west may perhaps be most satisfactorily explained and in fact as being etymologically pointed out to be that which lies over against the east as in Sanskrit. For this object we betake ourselves to the prepositional base *wi* mentioned at p 382, whence the comparative *wi dar*. We do not however require to deduce *ues-tar*\*

\* By writing *ue* Grimm marks the corruption of the *e* from *i* in which I readily agree with him



"towards the west," *wes-tana*," from the west," from the derivative *widar*, but we may keep to its base *wi*, with the assumption of a euphonic *s*, as in the Sanskrit, also, some prepositions terminating in vowels in certain combinations, and before consonants which are disposed to have an *s* before them, assume this letter, *e. g.* *pratiśhkaśa* for *pratikaśa*; and as in Latin *abs, os* (for *obs*), from *ab, ob* (§ 96). But if it were preferred to deduce *westar, westana*, from the derivative *widar*, it would then be necessary to force the *d* of derivation into the base, and, according to §. 102., change it into *s*. The east is more difficult of explanation than the west

Old High German *ôs-tar*, "towards the east," *ôs-tana*, "from the east," for several prepositions start up together that would gladly sustain this quarter of the heavens. It is not necessary that the preposition after which the east is named should elsewhere, also, be received as a German preposition; for in this appellation a preposition might have incorporated itself, which, except in this case, is foreign to the practice of the German language

[G Ed p 405] It may therefore be allowable for us, first of all, to turn to a preposition which, in the Indian language, is prefixed to the south, and, in the German, may have changed its position to the east, the more so, as, with prepositions, the principal point is always where one stands, and the direction to which one is turned, and one may, with perfect justice, turn that which is at the bottom to the uppermost, or to the front. In Zend, *ava*, which in Sanskrit signifies "below," exists as a pronoun, and means "this", and as this pronoun is also proper to the Slavonic (*OVO*, nom *ov*), and occurs in Greek as *αὖ*, (*αὖ-θι, αὐτός*, see p 387), it need not surprise us to find an obsolete remnant of this base in German, and that the east is taken as the side opposed to the west. Here it may be necessary to observe, that in Sanskrit the preposition *ava*, in like manner, annexes a euphonic *s*, from

was therefore by suppressing the last *a* but one would arise (as in Greek *av*) *ous* (different from our *aus* Old High German *u* Gothic *ut* in Sanskrit उत 'up') and hence according to § 60 *er* the old northern form is *austr austan*. The Latin *aus ter* might then—to which Grimm has already alluded (*Wiener Jahrb* B 29 p 77)—be placed with more confidence beside the Old High German as a sister form and led back by the hand of our comparative suffix to the preposition which in Sanskrit has given its name to the south, bold as it at the first glance might appear if we declared *aus ter* and वायु *andich* (*au + anch*) "outhern" to be related. The derivations from *hauru* or *auw* certainly deserve less notice. As however the juxtaposition of *aus ter* with the Latin *aus ter* and the Indian preposition *aua auw* is most suitable we refrain from giving other prepositional modes in which one might arrive at the appellation of the east in German. As the most natural point of departure we cannot place it in so subordinate a position to the west as to mark it out as "not west (*a uslar* from *a* [G 12 p 402] *u star*). We turn now to the south in Old High German *sun dar* towards the south *sundana* from the south," the connection of which with the *sunder* *sundir* mentioned at p 387 is not to be mistaken. The south therefore appeared to our ancestors as the remote distance and the reason for the appellation of this quarter of the heavens being clearly in allusion to space is a new guarantee for the prepositional derivation of the names for east and west as also for the fact that the designation of the north too, has subjected itself to a preposition although it is still more veiled in obscurity than that of the three sister appellations. We cannot however omit calling attention to the Sanskrit preposition *सिन्धु* *sindhu* which signifies out without and before sonant letters to which *d* belongs (§ 25) according to a universal law of euphony appears

in the form of *nir*, which it is also usual to represent as the original form

297 In the Old Slavonic the Indo-Greek comparative suffix occurs in *itoryi*, "the second" (in), in which the definitive pronoun is contained (p 352): *itory-i*, then, is formed from *vtoro-i* (§ 255 d), in which the cardinal number *dwa* is melted down to *v*, corresponding in this respect to the Zend *b* in *b-yarē*, "two years," but singular, with *b* as a hardened form from *v*. To the Sanskrit *५१५ katara*, "which of two?" (*m*) (Gothic *hva-thar*) and *५१५ ya-tara*, "which of both," corresponds etymologically, the Old Slavonic *ko-tory-i* (as definitive), older *ko-tery-i* and *ye-ter*, feminine *ye-tera* (*ye-τσα*), neuter *ye-tero*. The origin of these two pronouns is, however, forgotten, together with their comparative meaning, for *kotoryi* means "who?" and *yeter*, "some one" (compare p 352). Dobrowsky (p 343), however, in which he is

[G Ed p 407] clearly wrong, divides the suffix into *ot-or*, for although the interrogative base *KO* may lay aside its *o*, and combine with the demonstrative base *to* (*kto*, "quis?" Dobr p 342), still it is more in accordance with the history of language to divide *ko-toryi* than *ko-toryi* or *koto-ryi*, as the formation *or* would there stand quite isolated, and besides this the pronoun *i*, "he," from *yo*, does not occur in combination with the demonstrative base *to*, and yet *ye-ter* is said

298 A small number of comparatives are formed in Sanskrit by *ईयस्* *īyas*, and the corresponding superlative by *इश्थस्* *ishtha*, in which *ishtha*, as has been already remarked (p 389), we recognise a derivation from *īyas* in its contraction to *ish* (compare *ish ta*, "offered," from *yaj*), so that the suffix of the highest degree is properly *श्था* *tha*, through which, also, the ordinal numbers *चतुर्थस्* *chatu-r-thas* (*τέταρτος*), and *षष्ठस्* *shash-thas* (*ἕκτος*), are formed, for the notion of the superlative lies very close to the ordinal

numbers above two as that of order does to the superlatives and hence the suffix तम *tama* occurs in ordinal numbers e.g. विंशतिमम् *vinśati tama s* the twentieth wherefore *ma* in forms like पञ्चमम् *pancha ma s* the fifth may be held to be an abbreviation of *tama*. To the form *ish* contracted from *iyas*—euphonic for *is*—in Greek and Zend *is* corresponds the Latin *is* in the superlatives in *is simus* which I deduce through assimilation from *is-timus* (comp § 101) the simple *is* however which viewed from Latin is a contraction of *ios* (§ 22) appears in the simple form in the adverb *mag is* which may be compared with μέγισ in μέγιστος. In the strong cases (§ 129) the Indian comparative shews a broader form than the *iyas* above namely a long *ā* and a nasal preceding the *s* thus इयान् *iyāns* (see § 9). This form however [G Ed p 408] ever may originally have been current in all the cases, as the strong form in general (§ 129) as is probable through the pervading long *ō* in Latin *ioris iori*, &c. if one would not rather regard the length of the Latin *o* as compensation for the rejected nasal compare the old accusative *mel iosem* mentioned in § 22, with Sanskrit forms like गारियान् *gar iyāns om* (*graviores*). The breadth of the suffix, which is still remarkable in the more contracted form from *iyas* may be the cause why the form of the positive is exposed to great reductions before it so that not only final vowels are rejected as generally before Taddhita suffixes\* beginning with a vowel but whole suffixes together with the vowel preceding them are suppressed (Gramm Crit § 252) e.g. from मतिमत *i ati mat* intelligent from *mat* understanding comes *mat iyās* from *balatat* strong (gifted with strength,

\* The Taddhita suffixes are those which form derivative words not primitives direct from the root itself



from *bala + vat*), *bal-îyas*, from *kshipra*, "quick" (from the base *kship*, "to throw"), comes *kshêp-îyas*, from *kshudra*, "insignificant," *kshêd-îyas*, from *tîpra*, "satisfied," *trap-îyas*, since with vowels capable of Guna the dropping of the suffix is compensated by strengthening the radical syllable by Guna, as in the Zend *vaêdista*; which Burnouf (*Valûsta*, p. 22) deduces, as it appears to me, with equal correctness and acuteness from *vîdva*, (*vîdvô*, § 56<sup>b</sup>, Sanskrit *vidvas*), "knowing." With respect to *trapîyas*, from *tîpra*, let it be observed that *ar*, as Guna of *i*, is easily transposed to *ra* (*Gramm Crit* § 34<sup>b</sup>). compare the Greek *ἐδρακον* for *ἐδαρκον*, *πατράσι* for *παταρσι* (see p 290, G ed). In a similar manner M. Ag Benary explains the connection of *varîyas* with *uru* "great," with which he rightly compares the Greek *εὐρύς* (*Berl. Jahrb.* 1834. I.

[G Ed p 409] pp. 230, 231). But *varîyas* might also come from *vara*, "excellent," and *uru* might be an abbreviation of *varu*, which easily runs into one. To the superlative *ᾤσις* *varishtha*, which does not only mean *latissimus* but also *optimus*, the Greek *ἄριστος* (therefore *Φάριστος*) is without doubt akin, the connection of which with *εὐρύς* one could scarcely have conjectured without the Sanskrit. Remarkable, too, is the concurrence of the Greek with the Sanskrit in this point, that the former, like the latter, before the gradation suffix under discussion, disburthens itself of other more weighty suffixes (compare Burnouf's *Valûsta*, p 28); thus, *ἐχθιστος*, *αἰσχιστος*, *οἰκτιστος*, *κύδιστος*, *μήκιστος*, *ἀλγιστος*, from *ἐχθρος*, &c, exactly as above *kshêpishthas* and others from *kshipra*, and I believe I can hence explain, according to the same principle, the lengthening of the vowel in *μήκιστος*, *μᾶσσον*, from *μακρός*, on which principle also rests the Guna in analogous Sanskrit forms—namely, as a compensation for the suppression of the suffix. The case is the same with the lengthened vowel in forms like *θᾶσσον*, *ᾶσσον*, where Buttmann (§ 67 Rem. 3 N. 1<sup>o</sup>) assumes that

the comparative *i* has fallen back and united itself with the *α* (*α*) while in my opinion a different account is to be given of what has become of the *i* in forms like *θασσων*, *βρασσων* (§ 300) The formation of *μεγιστος* from *μεγας*, from *μεγαλο* *ς*, is similar to the origin in Sanskrit of *बहिष* *baniṣṭha* from *bahula* much from *bahu* much comes *bhuyishtha* and *μεγιστος* in relation to *ΜΕΓΑΛΟ* has lost as much as *baniṣṭha* compared with *bahula* only that the Sanskrit positive base is compensated for the loss of *ula* by the addition of a nasal which therefore as Ag Benary (I c) has very correctly remarked rests on the same principle with the Guna in *kshēpiṣṭha* &c \*

Remark —It will then also be necessary [G Ed p 410] —as Burnouf (Yagna p 131) first pointed out but afterwards (Vahista p 25) in my opinion wrongly retracted—to explain the *ṛ* of *sreyas* better, *śreshṭha* the best as coming from the *i* of *sri* fortune by Guna instead of the common view, in which I formerly concurred of substituting a useless *sra* as positive and hence by contraction with *iyas* *iṣṭha* forming *sreyas* *sreshṭha* From *sri* comes the derivative *sri* *mat* fortunate from which I deduce *sre yas* *sre ṣṭha*, by the prescribed removal of the suffix † although one might

\* The Guna, however in the gradation forms under discussion might also be accounted for in a different way namely by bringing it into connection with the Viddhi which occurs before many other Taddhita suffixes especially in patronymics as *वैवस्वत* *vaivasvata*, from *वैवस्व* *vaivasvat* On account of the great weight of the gradation suffixes *iyas* *iṣṭha* which has given rise to the suppression of the suffix of the positive base the initial vowel also of the same would accordingly be raised by the weaker Guna instead of by the Viddhi as usual (§ 26) Be that how it may one must in any case have ground to assume an historic connection between the Grecian vowel lengthening in *μηκτος* *θσς* *ν* and others and that of Sanskrit forms like *kshēpiyas*, *kshēpiṣṭha*

† If there existed, as in Zend, a *srira*, one might hence also derive the above gradations

expect in the superlative *śray-ishtha*, euphonic for *śrē-ishtha*, and on this ground it is that Burnouf takes his objection. But as in Greek *ἐκα-στος*, *ὀπό-στος* (see p 376), in spite of the want of the *ι* of *ιστος*, are nevertheless nothing else than superlative forms, I do not see why, in certain cases, in Sanskrit, also, the suppression of an *ι* may not hold good. This happens, moreover, in *sthē-shtha* from *sthi-ya*, "fast," *sphē-shtha* from *sphi-ra*, "swollen," and *prē-shtha* from *prīy-a*, "dear." In the latter case, after removing the suffix *a*, the preceding *y*, also, must retire, since *prīy* is only a euphonic alteration of *prī* (Gramm Crit § 51). As to the derivation, however, of the meanings *melior*, *optimus*, from a positive with the meaning "fortunate," it may be further remarked, that, in Sanskrit, "fortune" and "splendour" are generally the fundamental notions for that which is good and excellent, hence, *bhagavat*, "the honourable," "the

[G Ed. p 411] excellent," properly, "the man gifted with fortune", for our *besserer*, *bester*, also Gothic *bat-iza*, *bat-ists*, are associated with a Sanskrit root denoting fortune (*bhad*, whence *bhādya*, "fortunate," "excellent"), which Pott was acute enough first to remark (Etymol. Inquiries, p 245), who collates also *bōtjan*, "to use." The old *d* gives, according to § 87, in the Gothic *t*, and the Sanskrit *bh* becomes *b*. It might appear too daring if we made an attempt to refer *melior* also to this root, but cognate words often assume the most estranged form through doubled transitions of sound, which, although doubled, are usual. It is very common for *d* to become *l* (§ 17), and also between labial medials and the nasal of this organ there prevails no unfrequent exchange (comp § 63). If, also, the Greek *βελτίων*, *βέλτιστος*, should belong to this class, and the *τ* be an unorganic addition, which is wanting in *βέλτερος*, *βέλτατος*, *βελ* would then give the middle step between *भद्* *bhad* and *mel*. The ideal positive of *βελτίων*, namely *ἀγαθός*, might be connected with *अगृध* *agūdha*, "deep," with which, also, the Gothic *gōths* (theme

*gola*) is to be compared with *θ* according to rule for *स* *ā* (§ 69), and medials for Greek aspirates according to § 87

299 From the strong theme *ἰϋάνη* *iyāns* mentioned at § 298 comes the nominative *iyān* with the suppression of the final letter rendered necessary through § 94. The vocative has a short *a* and sounds *iyān*. To *iyān* answers the Greek *ἰών* and to the vocative *ἰῶν* answers *ἰόν*, to the neuter *ἰῶς* (N A V) identical with the weak theme corresponds the Latin *ius* (§ 22). The Greek however cannot become repossessed of the *s* which is abandoned in Sanskrit in the nominative and vocative masculine for legitimate reasons since it declines its comparative as though its theme terminated from the first with *i*: hence accusative *ἰόν* *α* for the Sanskrit *इयान्स्म* *iyāns am* Latin *ior em* (*iōs em* § 22) genitive *ἰόν* *ος* for *iyos os* *ior is*. However one might as Pott has already I believe noticed somewhere reduce the contracted forms like *βελτιω* *βελτιους* to an original *ιοσα* *ιοσες* *ιοσας*, corresponding to *iyānsam* *iyānsi* (neuter plural) *iyāns as* *ἰῶς as* the *σ* of which *as* is so common between two vowels would be rejected\*. On the other hand *ν* except in [G Ed p 412] comparatives on the presupposition that the contracted forms have rejected an *ν* and not *σ* is suppressed only in a few isolated words (*Ἀπολλῶ* *Ποσειδῶ* *εἰκῶ* *αἰδοῦς* and a few others) which however the theoretic derivation of the comparative *Σ* renders very embarrassing. We would therefore prefer giving up this and assuming that while the Sanskrit in the weak *i e* in the majority of cases has abandoned the former consonant of *ns* the Greek which was still less favourable to the *νσ*, has given up the latter as perhaps one may suppose in the oldest as it were pre-Grecian period forms like *βελτιονσα*. It is however remarkable that while all other European sister lan-

guages have only preserved the last element of the comparative *as*—the Latin in the form of *r*—and while the Sanskrit also shews more indulgence for the *s* than for the *n*, the Greek alone has preserved the nasal, so that in the comparative it differs in this respect from all the other languages. Without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zend it would be hardly possible to adduce from the European sister languages a cognate termination to the Greek *ῥων*, *ῥον*, or if *ῥον* and *ῥων* should be compared, one would think rather of a permutation of liquids,\* than that after the Greek *ν* the prototype of the Latin *r*, namely *σ*, has originally existed.

300 In Zend, the superlatives in *as̥as̥ ista* are more numerous than the corresponding ones in Sanskrit, and require no authentication. With regard to their theory, Burnouf has rendered important service, by his excellent

[G. Ed. p 413] treatise on the *Valista*, and his remarks are also useful to us in Sanskrit Grammar. In form *as̥as̥ ista* stands nearer to the Greek *ιστος* than the Indian *ishtha*, and is completely identical with the Gothic *ista*, nom, *ist'-s* (§ 135.), as the Zend frequently exhibits *t* for the Sanskrit aspirates. The comparative form which belongs to *ista* is much more rare, but perhaps only on account of the want of occasion for its appearance in the authorities which have been handed down to us, in which, also, the form in *tara* can only scantily be cited. An example of the comparative under discussion is the feminine *mas̥yēhi*, which occurs repeatedly, and to which I have already elsewhere† drawn attention‡ It springs from the positive base

\* Comp § 20

† Berl Jahrb. 1831 I p 372 I then conceived this form to be thus arrived at, that the *y* of the Sanskrit *iyas̥i* had disappeared, as in the genitive termination *hē*, from *स्य sya*, after which the *i* must have passed into *y*. Still the above view of the case, which is also the one chosen by Burnouf,



which it is clear that *v* is stronger than *y*, as it also is more powerful than *r*, hence *sauva* from *sarva*, "every-one" It is remarkable that the *i* also of *ihi* "thus" assimilates itself to the following *t*, hence, *thi*, which, in pronunciation, naturally leans upon the word preceding Therefore one might thus also, without presupposition of a form *yōn*, establish the assimilation from *iōn* As to the transition of the consonant of the positive base into *σ* (κρίσ-σων, βράσ-σων, βάσ-σων, μάσ-σων, ἐλάσ-σων, &c.), to which the *y* has assimilated, the transition of *τ*, *δ*, *θ*, into *σ* need least of all surprise us (see § 99), but with regard to the gutturals, the Old Slavonic may be noticed, in which, besides what has been remarked in § 255 (*m*), *y*, *i*, and *e* which latter comes very near the vowel combined with a *y*, and is frequently the remainder of the syllable *ye* exert an influence on a guttural preceding them, similar

[G Ed p 415] to that which the comparative *y* or *i* produces in Greek Before the *i*, namely, of the nominative plural, and before *ye* in the dative and locative singular, as before *i* and *ye* of the imperative, *ch* becomes *s*, e g. *gryes-i* from *gryech*, as *θάσ-σων* from *θάσ-γων*, from *ταχ-*, *g* becomes *ζ*, e g. *πρίϛι* from *πρίg*, as *μρίζων*, *δλίζων*, from *μρίζγων*, *δλίζγων*, from *μεγ-*, *δλιγ-*; *k* becomes *ch*, while in Greek *κ* is modified in the same way as *χ* On account of the contracted nature of the *ζ* (= *δσ*) no assimilation takes place after it, but the *y* entirely disappears, or, in *μρίζων*, is pressed into the interior of the word (comp §. 119), as in *ἀμρίνων*, *χρίρων*, which latter may be akin to the Sanskrit *अधर अधरा*, "the under (m)," consequently with aphæresis of the *ā* (comp §. 401). With the superlative *μέγιστος* compare the Zend *मय्यεζ* *mazista*, where *ζ* *z*, according to § 57, answers to the Sanskrit *h* of *महन् mahat*, "great", while in the above *मय्येζ* *mašyéh*, as in the positive *मास* (euphonically *masō*), *s* stands irregularly for *z*, as if the Zend, by its permutation of consonants in this word, would vie with the Greek, but

we find Vend S p 211 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *ma-yo* with ~ which I hold to be a neuter comparative thus 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌 *mazyo* *vidiao* the more (literally greater) wise

301 As in the Latin comparative a suffix has raised itself to universal currency which in Sanskrit and Greek is only sparingly applied but was perhaps originally similarly with the form in *tara* *τερος* in universal use so the German the Slavonic and Lithuanian in their degrees of comparison everywhere attach themselves to the more rare forms in Sanskrit and Greek and indeed in the Gothic the suffix of the comparative shews itself in the same shortened form in which it appears in the Sanskrit Zend Greek and Latin in its combination with the superlative suffix (see § 298 p 395 &c) namely as *is* and this most plainly in adverbs like *mais*, more whose con [G Ed p 416] nection with comparatives in the Sanskrit &c I first pointed out in the Berl Jahrb (May 1827 p 742) We must divide therefore thus *ma-is* and this word as well in the base *is* in the termination is identical with the Latin *mag is* (comp *μεγιστος* p 402) whence it is clear that the Gothic form has lost a guttural (compare *major* and *magior*) which in *mihils* great—which has weakened the old *a* to *i*—appears according to the rule for the removal of letters (§ 87) as *I* *Mais* therefore far as it seems to be separated from it, is in base and formation related to the Zend *max yō* (from *maz-yas*) which we have become acquainted with above (p 415 G ed) in the sense of more

Remark—There are some other comparative adverbs in *is* of which the first time I treated of this subject I was not in possession and which Grimm has since (III. 589 &c) represented as analogous to *mais* He has however afterwards l c p 88 agreed with Fulda in viewing *hauhs* αἰσθερον as the genitive of the positive *hauhs* high Yet *hauhs* stands in exactly the same relation to *hau hi-ra* the higher that *mais* does to *mai-ra* major



Compared with the Zend *maz-yô* and Greek *μείζων*, one might believe the *z* in *maiza* belonged to the positive base, particularly as the Old High German adds a second comparative suffix to its adverb *mêr*, answering to the Gothic *mar* (*mérno*, 'major') because in *mêr* no formal expression of the comparative relation was any longer felt. *Rihtis*, which Grimm wishes to leave under the forms which, III. p 89, are considered as genitive, seems to me properly to signify *potius*, or our *rechter*; and I consider it, therefore, as a comparative, although the Old High German *rehtes*, examined from the point of view of the Old High German, can only be a genitive, and the comparative adverb is *rehtôr*. The comparative *ga-raihtôza*, 'justior,' which may be cited in Gothic, does not prevent the assumption that there may have been also in use a *raihliza*, as in all adjectives *iza* may just as well be expected as *ôza*, for, together with the comparative adverb *frumôzô*, 'at first' (R. xi. 35), occurs the superlative *frumists*. Perhaps, however, the genius of the Old High German language has allowed itself to be deceived through the identity of the comparative suffix *is* with the genitive termination *i-s*, and taking some obsolete comparatives, which have been transmitted to it

[G Ed p 417] for genitives, left them the *s*, which, in evident comparatives, must pass into *r*, but is also still retained as *s* in *wins*, 'pejus.' I prefer to consider, also, *allis*, 'omnino,' as a comparative, in order entirely to exclude the Gothic apparent genitive adverbs from the class of adjectives. In the Old High German, together with *alles*, 'omnino,' exists *alles*, 'aliter,' which, according to its origin, is an essentially different word—through assimilation from *alyes*, as above (p 414 G ed.) ἄλλος in which the comparative termination, in the Latin *ali-ter* and similar adverbs, is to be observed. The probability that these forms, which, to use the expression, are clothed as genitives, are, by their origin, comparatives, is still further increased thereby, that together with *emes*,

*semel* and *alter* *aliter*, there occur also forms in the guise of superlatives, namely *cineſt* once (see Griff, p 329) and *anderest* again. Some comparative adverbs of this sort omit in Gothic the *z* of *is* thus *min s* less (compare *minor minus* for *minor minus*) perhaps *var s*, worse which is raised anew into *varisra* *pejor* and may be connected with the Sanskrit *atara posterus* as above *χρειω* was compared with *αττα* *adhara* *scith s* *amplius* (from *scithu* 'lite'), and probably also *sunt statum* and *onals subito*."

302 The comparative-suffix *is* required in Gothic where the consonant *s* is no longer capable of declension\* an inorganic addition or otherwise the sibilant would have been necessarily suppressed. The language however preserved this letter as its meaning was still too powerfully perceived by the favourite addition *an* which we have seen above though without the same urgent necessity joined to participial bases in *nd* in their adjective state (§ 289). As then *s* comes to be inserted between two [G Ld p 418] vowels it must by § 96 (5) be changed into *z* hence the modern theme *MAI/IA* from the original *MAIS*, which has remained unaltered in the adverb. The nominative masculine and neuter are according to §§ 110 111 *maia mai o*. On the other hand the feminine base does not develop itself from the masculine and neuter base *MAI/IA*—as in general from the inorganic bases in *an* of the indefinite adjectives

\* A base in *s* as the above-mentioned *maia*, would not be distinguished from the theme in all the cases of the singular as also in the nominative and accusative plural as of final double *s* the latter must be rejected (compare *drus* 'fall' for *drus s* from *drusa s* § 29? 1st Note). In the nominative and genitive singular, therefore the form *maia-s* must have become *maia* just as, in the nominative and accusative plural, where *ahman s* comes from the theme *ahman*. The Latin singular is in bases ending in a consonant without exception devoid of inflection and so is the accusative in substantives of every kind.

no feminines arise but to the original feminine base in *i*, which exists in the Sanskrit and Zend, an *n* is added, as in the participle present, thus *MAIZEIN* (*ei* = *i*, § 70.), from *mais* + *ein*, answers to the Zend feminine base of the same import, *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* *mašyēhi*, and Sanskrit forms like *गरि॒यासि* *garīyas-i*, from *garīyas*. The nominative *maizei* may then, according to § 142., be deduced from *MAIZEIN*, or may be viewed as a continuation of the form in Zend and Sanskrit which, in the nominative, is identical with the theme (§ 137), in which respect again the participle present (§ 290) is to be compared. These two kinds of feminines, namely, of the said participle and the comparative, stand in Gothic very isolated, but the ground of their peculiarity, which Jacob Grimm, III. 566, calls still undiscovered (compare I 756), appears to me, through what has been said, to be completely disclosed, and I have already declared my opinion [G Ed p 419] in this sense before \* The Old High German

\* Beil Jahrb May 1827, p 743, &c Perhaps Grimm had not yet, in the passage quoted above, become acquainted with my review of the two first parts of his Grammar, since he afterwards (II. 650.) agrees with my view of the matter I find, however, the comparison of the transition of the Gothic *s* into *z* with that of the Indian *स* into *ष* *sh* inadmissible, as the two transitions rest upon euphonic laws which are entirely distinct, of which the one, which obtains in the Gothic (§ 86 5), is just as foreign to the Sanskrit, as the Sanskrit (§ 21 and Gramm Crit 101<sup>a</sup>) is to the Gothic It is further to be observed, that, on account of the difference of these laws, the Sanskrit *ष* *sh* remains also in the superlative, where the Gothic has always *st*, not *zt* In respect to Greek, it may here be further remarked, that Grimm, I c p 651, in that language, also, admits an original *s* in the comparative, which he, however, does not look for after the *ν* of *ων*, as appears from § 299, but before it, so that he wishes to divide thus *μελ-ζων*, as an abbreviation of *μεγίζων*, and regards the *ζ* not as a corruption of the *γ*, as Buttman also assumes, but as a comparative character, as in the kindred Gothic *ma-iza*. The Greek *ων*, *ον*, would, according to this, appear identical with the unorganic Gothic *an* in *MAIZAN*, while we have assigned it, in § 299, a legitimate foundation, by tracing it back to the Sanskrit *āns*

has brought its feminine comparatives into the more usual path, and gives, as corresponding to the Gothic *minni-er* the lesser (fem) not *minni-ri* but *minni-ra*. The Gothic sibilant however was in the High German comparatives in the earliest period transmuted into *r* whence in this respect *minni-ro minni-ra* has more resemblance to the Latin *minor* than to the Gothic *minni-ra minni-zei*.

303 The comparative suffix in the Gothic, besides *is* *an* exhibits also the form *ōs ō-an* it is however more rare, but in the Old High German has become so current that there are more comparatives in it in *ōro* (nominative masculine) *ōra* (nominative feminine and neuter) than in *iro ira* or *ero, era*. The few forms in *ŌZAN* which can be adduced in Gothic are *svinthō-a fortior* (nominative masculine), *frōdoza, prudentior* *frumō-a prior* *hlasōza hilarior*, *garahitō-a justior* *framaldrō-a protectior* *ælate*, *usdaudo-ra, sollicitior* *unsukunthōza*, "*inclarior* (Massmann p 17) and the ad verbs *sniumundos σπουδαιότερος*, and *alyaleikōs ετερος*. How then is the *ō* in these forms to be explained contrasted with the *i* of *IS IZAN*? I believe only as coming from the long *a* of the Sanskrit strong themes *iyans* or *yans* (§§ 299 300) with *ō* according to rule for यि *ā* (§ 69). If one starts from the latter [G Ed p 420] form which, in the Zend, is the only one that can be adduced then beside the nasal which is lost also in the Latin and in the weak cases in the Sanskrit *yāns* has lost in the Gothic either the *ā* or the *y* (=j) which when the *ā* is suppressed must be changed into a vowel. The Gothic *ōs ō-* and still more the Old High German *ōr* correspond, therefore exactly to the Latin *ōr* in *minor minor is* for *minor*. There is reason to assume that in the Gothic originally *y* and *ō* existed in juxta position to one another, and that for *minni-ra* the lesser was used *minnyō-ra* and for *frōdo-a* the more intelligent *frōdyō-a*.

The forms which have lost the *y* are represented in Latin by *minor*, *minus*, and *plus*, and those with *ô* suppressed by *mag-is*. One cannot, however, in Gothic, properly require any superlatives in *ÔSTA*, nom. *ôst'-s*, corresponding to the comparatives in *ôs*, *ôz*, because this degree in the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Latin always springs from the form of the comparative, contracted to *is*, *ish*. It is, however, quite regular, that, to the *frumôza*, "*prior*," corresponds a *frumists*, "*primus*," not *frumôsts*. To the remaining comparatives in *ôza* the superlative is not yet adduced, but in the more recent dialects the comparatives have formed superlatives with *ô*, after their fashion, and thus, in the Old High German, *ôst* usually stands in the superlative, where the comparative has *ôr*. The Gothic furnishes two examples of this confusion of the use of language, in *lasivôsts*, "*infirmus*" (1 Cor. xii. 22.), and *aimôsts*, "*miserimus*" (1 Cor. xv. 19).

304 In the rejection of the final vowel of the positive base before the suffixes of intensity the German agrees with the cognate languages, hence *sut'-iza*, from *SUTU\**, "*sweet*",

[G Ed p 421] *hard'-iza*, from *HARDU*, "*hard*", *seith-s* (*thana-seiths*, "*amplius*"), from *SEITHU*, "*late*", as in the Greek *ἡδύων* from *ἡδύς*, and in the Sanskrit *laghîyas* from *laghu*, "*light*." *Ya* is also rejected, hence *spêd'-iza*, from *SPEDYA*, "*late*" (see p 358, Note 7), *reik'-iza*, from *REIKYA*, "*rich*". One could not therefore regard the *ô*, in forms like *frôdôza*, as merely a lengthening of the *a* in *FRÔDA* (§. 69), as it would be completely contrary to the principle of these formations, not only not to suppress the final vowel of the positive base, but even to lengthen it. The explanation of the comparative *ô* given at §. 303 remains therefore the only one that can be relied upon.

\* The positive does not occur, but the Sanskrit *suâdu-s* and Greek *ἡδύς* lead us to expect a final *u*.

305 In the Old Slavonic according to Dobrowsky p 332  
 96 the comparative is formed in three ways namely

(1) By masculine *u* feminine *shi*, neuter *yee* as *únu*,  
 the better (m) *únsht* the better (f), *únyee* the best  
 (n) from a positive which has been lost as *batiza melior*  
 and *αμειων* and it is perhaps connected in its base with  
 the latter so that *α μιν* have become *o* (§ 255 a.) but *μ*, *υ*  
 as frequently occurs with *n* and this *u* with the preceding  
*o* has become *ú* (x)\* *Mnū* the lesser (m), fem *mensht*  
 neuter *mnyee* spring in like manner from a positive which  
 has been lost *Bolu* the greater fem *bolshi* neuter *bolyee*  
 may be compared with the Sanskrit *baliyān* the stronger  
 (p 396) fem *baliyasī*, neuter *baliyas*† For [G Ed p 42<sup>o</sup>]  
*bolu* is also used *bolyee* and all the remaining comparatives  
 which belong to this class have *yee* for *it* and thus answer  
 better to the neuter form *yee* If as appears to be the case the  
 form *yee* is the genuine one, then *ye* answers to the Sanskrit  
*yas* of *jya yas*, *bhā yas*, *vr̥ yas* &c (§ 300) and the loss of the  
*s* is explained by § 255 (l) the final *i* of *ye-i* however is the  
 definitive pronoun (§ 284) for comparatives always follow  
 in the masculine and neuter the definite declension In the  
 feminine in *shi* it is easy to recognise the Sanskrit *si* of *iyas i*  
*oi yas i* and herewith also the Gothic *ei* (oblique theme) *LLIN*

The *a* in *αμειων* appears to me to be privative so that *μειων* would  
 seem to be a sister form to the Latin *minor* Gothic *minni* a Slavonic  
*mnū* and *αμειων* would properly signify 'the not lesser the not  
 more trifling' Perhaps this word is also inherent in *omnis* so that *o*  
 for *a* would be the negation which in Latin appears as *in*, where it  
 may be observed that in Sanskrit *a sakrit* literally 'not once' has taken  
 the representation of the meaning several times

† The positive *celū* with *v* for *b* and *e* for *o* occurs only in this de-  
 finite form (Dobr p 370) the primitive and indefinite form must be *cel*  
 With respect to the stronger *o* corresponding to the weaker letter *e*  
 (§ 200 a) *bolu* in the positive answers to the manner in which vowels  
 are strengthened in Sanskrit as mentioned at § 498

p 418 G ed), that is to say, *bol-shi*, "the greater (fem.)," corresponds to the Sanskrit बलियसि *balīyasī*, "the stronger (f)," and *men-shi*, "the lesser," to the Gothic *minn-izei*. While, therefore, the Slavonic masculine and neuter have lost the *s* of the Sanskrit *yas*, the feminine has lost the *ya* of *yas-ī*\*. This feminine *shi*, also, in departure from (2) and (3), keeps free from the definite pronoun. There are some comparative adverbs in *e*, as the abbreviation of *ye* (§. 255. n.), which in like manner dispense with the definite pronoun, thus, *înê*, "better", *bole*, "greater" in Serbian MSS *înye*, *bolje*,

[G Ed p 423.] *pache*, "more," probably related to *παχύς*, *πάσσων*, so that (which is very obscure) the final vowel of *pache* for *pach-ye*, for reasons which have been given before, is, in fact, identical with the Greek *σο* of *πάσ-σον*, for *πασ-γον*. The *ch* of *pache* may, according to p 415 G ed., be regarded as a modification of *k*, as the first *σ* of *πάσσων* has developed itself from *χ*. Thus the *ζ* of *dolž-ye*, "longer" (neuter and adverbial), as euphonic representative of the *g* of *dolg*, *dolga*, *dolgo* (*longus*, *a*, *um*), answers remarkably to the Greek *ζ* in *μείζων*, *ὀλίζων*, for *μείγων*, *ὀλίγων*. That, however, the positive *dolg* is connected with the Greek *δολιχός* needs scarce to be mentioned. Somewhat more distant is the Sanskrit दीर्घस् *dīrgha-s*, of the same meaning, in which the frequently-occurring interchange between *r* and *l* is

\* It may be proper here to call remembrance to the past gerund, properly a participle, which in the strong cases *vāns*, nom masc *vān* for *vans*, fem *ushī*, neuter *vat* (for *vas*), corresponds to the Sanskrit of the reduplicated preterite in *vas*. The Old Slavonic has here, in the nominative masculine, where the *s* should stand at the end, lost this letter, according to § 255 (l), as *by-v*, "qui fuit," but *by-ushi*, "quæ fuit", and in the masculine also, in preference to the comparative, the *s* again appears in the oblique cases, because there, in the Sanskrit, after the *s* follow terminations beginning with a vowel, so in *iek-sh*, "eum qui dixit," the *sh* corresponds to the Sanskrit *vāns-am*, as *iui ud-vāns-am*, "eum qui plorat"

to be noticed (§ 20) The *i* of *δολιχος* however shews itself by the evidence of the Slavonic and Sanskrit to be an organic addition Let *garyec* *pejuc* be compared with the Sanskrit *gariyas* "*gravius* from *guru*, heavy"—according to Burnouf's correct remark from *garu* as this adjective is pronounced in Pali—through the assimilating influence of the final *u* to which the kindred Greek *βαρυς* has permitted no euphonic reaction

(2) The second by far the most prevalent form of the Old Slavonic comparative is nominative masculine *shu*, feminine *shaya* neuter *shee* The *i* of *shu* is the definitive pronoun which in the feminine is *ya* and in the neuter *e* for *ye* (§§ 282 284) After the loss then of this pronoun there remains *shu sha she*, and these are abbreviations of *shyo shya shye* as we have seen p 33<sup>2</sup> G ed., the adjective base *SIN*  $\dot{\text{I}}$  *O* (nominative *sinj*) before its union with the defining *i* contracted to *sim* (*sim i* neuter *sine e* for *sinje ye* The definite feminine of *SIN*  $\dot{\text{I}}$  *O* is *sinja ya* and as to the feminine comparatives not being *shya ya* but *sha ya* this rests on the special ground that sibilants glidily free themselves from a following *y* especially [G Ed p 404] before *a* (Dobrowsky p 12) so in the feminine nominatives *dúsha súsha chasha* for *súsha* &c. (Dobr p 279). The relation of the comparative form under discussion to the Sanskrit *यस yas* and Zend *yas yas* (p 101) is therefore to be taken thus that the *ya* which precedes the sibilant is suppressed, as in the above feminines in *shu* but for it at the end is added an unorganic  $\dot{\text{I}}$  *O* which corresponds to the Gothic Lithuanian  $\dot{\text{I}}$  *A* in the themes *NIU*  $\dot{\text{I}}$  *A* *NAU*  $\dot{\text{I}}$  *A* new answering to *यव nava* *NOIU* NEO Slavonic *NOI* *O* This adjunct  $\dot{\text{I}}$  *O* has preserved the comparative sibilant in the masculine and neuter which in the first formation must yield to the euphonic law § 255 (1) Examples of this second formation are, *un shu* the better (*m*) feminine



*ûn-shaya*, neuter *ûn-shee*, *pûst-shiŭ* from *pûst*, theme *PŪSTO*, "desert" Hence it is clear that the final vowel of the positive base is rejected, as in all the cognate languages, however difficult the combination of the *t* with *sh*. Even whole suffixes are rejected, in accordance with § 298, as, *glûb-shiŭ* from *glûbok*, "deep" (definite, *glûbok-y-i*), *sladshiŭ* from *sladok*, "sweet."\*

(3) Masculine *yeŭshiŭ*, feminine *yeŭshaya*, neuter *yeŭshee*; but after *sch*, *sh*, and *ch*, *ai* stands for *yei* and this *ai* evidently stands only euphonicallly for *yaï*, since the said sibilants, as [G Ed p 425] has been already remarked, gladly divest themselves of a following *y* hence *blasch-aiŭshiŭ*, "the better" (masculine), from *blag* (theme *BLAGO*), "good,"† since *g*, through the influence of the *y* following, gives way to a sibilant, which has subsequently absorbed the *y*, compare *ðlíŭ-ων*, for *ðlíŭ-íων*, *ðlíŭ-yων* (p 402) so *tish-aiŭshiŭ*, from *tich* (theme *TICHO*), "still,"‡ as in the Greek *θάσ-σων* from *ταχύς*. As example of the form

- I hold *ho*, whence in the nom masc *h*, for the suffix of the positive base, but the preceding *o* for the final vowel of the lost primitive, and this *o* corresponds either to a Sanskrit *a*, according to § 255 (*a*), or to an *u*, according to § 255 (*e*), for example, *tano-h*, "thin," theme *TANOKO*, corresponds to the Sanskrit *tanu-s*, "thin," Greek *τανν*, and *slado-h* to the Sanskrit *swâdu-s*, "sweet," with exchange of the *v* for *l*, according to § 20 Thus the above *slad-shiŭ* shews itself to be originally identical, as well in the suffix of the positive as of the other degrees with the Greek *ἥδ-íων* and Gothic *sut iza* (§ 304), far as the external difference may separate them, and to the Slavonic is due, as to the truer preservation of the fundamental word, the preference above the Greek and Gothic, although, on account of the unexpected transition of the *v* into *l*, the origin of the Slavonic word is more difficult to recognise

† Dobrowsky says (p 334) from *blagyn* (this is the definite, see § 284) it is, however, evident that the comparative has not arisen from the adjective compounded with a pronoun, but from the simple indefinite one

‡ Compare the Sanskrit adverb *tîshnîm*, "still, silent," and refer to § 205 (*m*)

with *yei yun yeishu* junior from *yun* may serve. Whence comes then the *yei* or *ai* (for *yai*) which distinguishes this formation from the second? It might be supposed that to the first formation in *yei* where for example also *yun yei* the younger (in) occurs that of the second has also been added as in Old High German *mêraro* the greater (masculine) and in Gothic probably *rairsala* the worse (p. 105) are raised twice to the comparative degree and so in Persian the superlatives *ut rin* in my opinion continue as their last element the comparative *یادری* *yâdri* which forms in the nominative masculine *yâdn* and from this could be easily contracted to *in*. In Persian the comparative is formed through *ter* as *behter* the better whence *behterin* 'the best'. Now it deserves remark that in Old Slavonic the formation before us frequently occurs with a superlative meaning while in the more modern dialects the superlative relation is expressed through the comparative with *na* more prefixed (probably from *mai* = Gothic *mais* according to § 225 1). The only objection to this mode of explanation [C F] 1 4 6] is this that the element of the first formation *yei* has not once had aside the definitive pronoun *i* which is foreign to the comparative so that therefore in *yun yei shu* the said pronoun would be continued twice. There is however another way of explaining this *yeishu* or (*y*)*aishu* namely as an exact transmission of the Sanskrit *iyas* or *yas*, from which the second formation has only preserved the sibilant but the third together with this letter may have retained also that which preceded. Still even in this method the *i* of *yei* (*y*)*ai* is embarrassing if it be not assumed that it owes its origin to a transposition of the *i* of *iya*.

306 As to the remark made at p. 100 that among the European languages the Greek only has preserved the *iyas* which the Sanskrit shows in the strong cases of the comparative suffix *iyâs* I must here admit a limitation in

[illegible]

† This has been already alluded to by Grimm (III 635, Note \*), who has, however, given the preference to another explanation, by which *esnis* is similarly arrived at with the Latin *issimus*

The emphasis upon the *e* of *geresnis* may be attributable to the original length in the Sanskrit strong theme *gariyans*. Hence the astonishing accuracy may justly be celebrated with which the Lithuanian even to the present day continues to use the Sanskrit comparative suffix *iyāns* or rather its more rare form preferred in Zend *yāns*.

307 The Lithuanian superlative suffix is only another modification of the comparative. The nasal that is to say which in the latter is transposed is in the superlative left in its original place. It is however as often happens resolved into *u* \* and to the *s* which ends the theme in the Sanskrit which in Lithuanian is not declinable (§ 128) is added *ia*. Hence *GERAUSIA* the nominative of which however in departure from *geresnis* has dropped not the *a* but the *i*: thus *gerausa*; gen *gerausio* and in the feminine *gerausa* *gerausios* in which forms [G Ed p 428] contrary to the principle which is very generally followed in the comparative and elsewhere the *i* has exercised no euphonic influence.

Remark.—With respect to the Sanskrit gradation suffixes *tara tama* I have further to add that they also occur in combination with the inseparable preposition *तृ* *ut* hence *ut tara* the higher *ut tama* the highest as above (§ 295) *af tama* and in Latin *ex timus in timus*. I think however I recognise the base of *ut tara ut tama* in the Greek *υς* of *ὕς τερος υς τας* with the unorganic spir *asp* as in *εκατερος*, corresponding to the Sanskrit *ekatara s* and with *σ* from *τ* (compare § 99) in which it is to be remarked that also in the Zend for *ut tara ut tama* according to § 102 *us tara us tema* might be expected.

\* Comp § 255 (*g*) in addition to which it may be here further remarked, that in all probability the *u* also in Gothic conjunctives like *hailau hailautau*, is of nasal origin.

## NUMERALS.

## CARDINAL NUMBERS.

308. I. In the designation of the number *one* great difference prevails among the Indo-European languages, which springs from this, that this number is expressed by pronouns of the 3d person, whose original abundance affords satisfactory explanation regarding the multiplicity of expressions for *one*. The Sanskrit *ēka*, whose comparative we have recognised in the Greek *ἐκάτερος*, is, in my opinion, the combination of the demonstrative base *ē*, of which hereafter, with the interrogative base *ka*, which also, in combination with *api*, “also” (nom. masc. *kō’pi*), signifies “whoever”, and even without this *api*, if an interrogative expression precedes, as Bhagavad-Gîtâ, II 21, कथं स पुरुषः पार्थ कञ् घातयति हन्ति कम् *kathan sa purushah Pârtha kan ghâtayati hanti kam*, “How can this person, O Pârtha, cause one to be slain, (or) slay one?” The Zend 𐬀𐬀𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀

[G Ed p 429] *aēva*, is connected with the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs *ēva*, “also,” “only,” &c, and *ēvaṃ*, “so,” of which the latter is an accusative, and the former, perhaps, an instrumental, according to the principle of the Zend language (§ 158.) The Gothic *ain*’-s, theme *AINA*, our *einer*, is based on the Sanskrit defective pronoun *ēna* (§. 72) whence, among others, comes the accusative masculine *ēna-m*, “this” To this pronominal base belongs, perhaps, also the Old Latin *oinos*, which occurs in the Scipionan epitaphs, from which the more modern *ūnus* may be deduced, through the usual transition of the old *ō* into *u*, which latter is lengthened to make up for the *i* suppressed Still *ūnus* shews, also, a surprising resemblance to the Sanskrit *ūna*-s, which properly means “less,” and is prefixed to the higher numerals in order to express diminution by one, as, *ūnavinshati*, “undeviginti,” *ūnatinshat*, “undetriginta” This *ūnas* could

not have appeared in Latin, more accurately retained than under the form of *ūnus* or more correctly *unus*. The Greek *EN* is founded it is highly probable in like manner on the demonstrative base *एन* *ena* and has lost its final vowel as the Gothic *AINA* in the masculine nominative *ains* with respect to the *e* for *é* compare *εκατερος*. On the other hand *οἷος*, *unicus* if it has arisen from *οἷος* compare *οἶνος*) as *μειζω* from *μειζοια* has retained the Indian diphthong more truly and has also preserved the final vowel of *एन* *éna*. If *οἷος* the number one in dice really has its name from the idea of unity one might refer this word to the demonstrative base *अन* *ana* Slavonic *ONO* (nominative *on* 'that') which also plays a part in the formation of words where *οἷη* corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix *and* (feminine of the masculine and neuter *anu*) if it is not to be referred to the medial participle in *ana* as *μυνη* to *mána*. The Old Slavonic *yedni* one is clearly connected with the Sanskrit *आदि* *ádi* the first with *y* which has been prefixed according to § 255 (n) on the other hand in the Lithuanian *uana* s [G Ed p 430] if it is connected with the Gothic *AINA* and Sanskrit *एन* *ena* in *unor*, *unc* *w* has been prefixed. In regard to the *ie* for *é* compare also *wie* *te* knowledge with *वेदि* *védi* I know.

Remark.—The German has some remarkable expressions in which the number one lies very much concealed as to its form, and partly too as to its idea they are in Gothic *haihs* one eyed *hums* one handed *halls* lame and *halbs* half. In all these words the number one is expressed by *ha*, and in this syllable I recognise a corruption of the abovementioned Sanskrit *क* *ka* for *एक* *éka* one which is founded on the universal rule for the mutation of consonants (§ 87). It would be erroneous to refer here to the Zend *ha* of *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *ha keret* once (Sanskrit *सकृत्* *sakṛt*) as the Zend *h*

thirteen, commits a similar error, and awkwardly gives instead of *tri-daśan*, *trayô-daśan*—euphonic for *trayas-daśan*—where the masculine plural nominative instead of the theme, which is adapted for all genders, is not well selected. The Latin *tre-decim* is therefore a more pure formation, as it dispenses with a case-sign in the first member of the compound: just so the Lithuanian *try-lika*, not *trys-lika*. This *lika*, which concludes the form, in all Lithuanian adding numerals (eleven to nineteen), exchanges the old *d* for *l*, as in German, and is therefore as far estranged from the simple *deszint's* as the Gothic *libi* from *taihun*; partly, as the second consonant in *lika* has maintained itself in its oldest form received from the Greek, and has not become a sibilant; so that *lika* and *δέκα* resemble each other very closely. The Lithuanian *lika*, therefore, is derived, like the Gothic *libi* and the French *ze* in *onze*, *douze*, &c., from the old compound which has been handed down, and cannot, therefore, be censured for its want of agreement with the simple number ten: it is no longer conscious of its meaning, and, like an inanimate corpse, is carried by the living inferior number. As, however, the smaller number in these compounds is still living, so that in the feeling of the speaker the numbers *wieno-lika*, *dwy-lika*, &c., do not appear as independent simple designations of numbers—as, perhaps, *septyni* is felt to be independent of each of the earlier numbers—so, naturally, in these compounds the first member has kept tolerably equal pace with the form which it shews in its isolated state; on which account *wieno-lika*, if it is regarded as an ancient compound from the time of the unity of language, or perhaps as derived from *एकादशन्* *ēkā-daśan*, [G. Ed. p. 450.] has nevertheless undergone, in its initial member, a renovation; as also in Gothic *ainlif*, in Greek *ἐνδέκα*, in Latin *undecim*, have regulated their first member according to the form which is in force for the isolated number one. On the other hand, *δῶδεκα* is almost entirely the Sanskrit *dwā-daśa*

also, the number ten, in compounds like *on-ze*, *dou-ze*, *trei ze*, is so remote from the expression of the simple ten, that one would hardly venture to pronounce the syllable *ze* to be *nkiu*, or originally identical with *dix*, if it were not historically certain that *onze*, *douze*, &c., have arisen from *undecim*, *duodecim*, and that therefore *ze* is a corruption of *decim*, as *dix* is a less vitiated form of *decem*. If, then, *onze*, *douze*, &c., have assumed the appearance of uncompounded words through the great alteration of the expression for the number ten contained in them, the same holds good with regard to our *eif* and *zuolf*, in which, perhaps, as in *onze* and *douze*, a connection with *ein* and *zwei* may be recognised, but none with *zehn*; and in the English eleven, also, the relation to one is entirely obliterated. But with regard to our using for thirteen, fourteen, &c., not *dreif*, *vierf*, or similar forms in *f*, but *dreizehn*, *vierzehn*, &c., in which *zehn* is just as unaltered as the *drei* and *vier*, this arises from the Germans having forgotten the old Indo-European compounds for these numbers, and then having compacted the necessary expressions anew from the elements as they exist uncompounded. Nay, even [G. Ed. p. 449] the Greek has reconstructed afresh, as well as it could, its numerals from thirteen upwards, after that the old more genuine compounds had fallen into disuse; but this has been done, I must say, in a clumsy, awkward fashion, by which the addition of a particle signifying *and* was found requisite in an attempt at extreme perspicuity, while *εἷδεκα*, *δῶδεκα*, move more freely, and are suited to the spirit of the ancient compounds. The literal meaning, too, of *τρισκαῖδεκα* (for *τρίδεκα*) is “thrice and ten,” and the numeral adverb *τρίς*, instead of the bare theme *τρι*, is here just as much a mistake as the masculine plural nominative serves as a reproach to the *τρεσσεκαῖδεκα*, and is inferior in purity to the Sanskrit *chatur-daśan*, not *chatvāras-daśan* (*chatvārṣ-daśan*). On the other hand, the Sanskrit, in the designation of the number



[G. Ed. p. 451.] simple number must be regulated.”\* The languages, however, do not proceed so pedantically; and if they hold any thing understood, as very commonly happens, they do not expressly state that any thing remains over to be expressed. It is certain, however, that the Slavonic languages, in their expressions for eleven to twenty, do not keep back any thing to be understood, but form those expressions, after the loss of the old, no longer intelligible compounds, anew, with the annexed preposition *na*, “over”; e. g. in Old Slavonic, where the numbers eleven, twelve, thirteen, no longer occur, *chetyri-na-desyaty*, “four over ten.” The ordinal numbers for eleven and twelve are *yedinyi-na-desyaty*, “the first over ten,” *vtoryi-na-desyaty*, “the second over ten.” In the same manner proceeds the twin sister of the Lithuanian—accompanying it, but corrupted—the Lettish, in which *weenpazmit* signifies “eleven,” as it appears to me, with contraction of the *d(e)s* of *desmit*, “ten,” to *z*, and overleaping the *e*. This procedure in Lettish has no doubt originated from the older *lika* being no longer intelligible. If it was to be so understood, as Ruhig has taken it, its form would be palpable, and the Lettians might have been satisfied with it. With reference to the composition of the numerals under discussion, there remains to be noticed a most remarkable coincidence of the Lithuanian and German with a Prâkrit dialect, which coincidence, when I formerly touched upon this

---

\* Grimm’s view is certainly much more natural, “ten and one over, two over.” Only it would be to be expected, if the language wished to designate the numbers eleven and twelve as that which they contain more than ten, that they would have selected for combination with one and two a word which signifies “and over, or more;” and not an exponent of the idea “to leave,” “to remain.” It would, moreover, be more adapted to the genius and custom of the later periods of the language, not to forget the number ten in the newly-formed compounds, like the Lettish and Slavonic. J. Grimm, in his “History of the German Language,” p. 246, agrees with my explanation of *eilf*, *zwölf*, and analogous forms in Lith. and Slavonic.

( $\omega$  for  $\delta$ , according to §. 4.), and is as similar to it as possible, as  $\upsilon$  ( $F$ ) in Greek cannot be pronounced after consonants, and in the first syllable, also, could not assimilate itself to the preceding consonant (compare  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\varsigma$  from  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ ), for  $\delta\delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$  could not be uttered. In Latin, *duodecim* has formed its first member exactly after the simple form: on the other hand, the French has paid no regard to the form in which the preceding number appears in its isolated state, but has left the composition entirely in the old form, only with the abbreviations which time has by degrees introduced. With reference to the isolated state of the smaller number, it would have been, perhaps, necessary in French to have said *unze*, *deuze*, *troize*, &c. After what has been stated, I think no one can any longer doubt, that in our *elf* (*elf*) and *zwölf*, strange as it at the first glance may appear, a word is contained expressing the number ten, and identical in its origin with *daśan*,  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha$ , and *zehn*. If, however, the older *LIBI*, *lif*, and Lithuanian *lika*, be regarded without the suspicion arising, that in them corrupt though very common permutations of sounds may have preceded, then one would propose in Lithuanian a root *lik*, and in Gothic *lif* or *lib* (Gothic *af-lifnan*, "*relinqui, superesse*," *laibós*, "*reliquiæ*"), which both signify "to remain," and are also connected with each other and with the Greek  $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omega$  ( $\Delta\text{I}\Pi$ ). Grimm, who has recognised (II. 946) the original identity of our *lif* and the Lithuanian *lika*, has perhaps allowed himself to be led astray by Ruhig in the meaning of these expressions, and deduces the latter from *likti*, "*linqui, remanere*," the former from *leiban*, "*manere*." Ruhig, according to Mielcke, p. 58, holds *lika* for the 3d person plural, since he says, "Composition in the cardinal numbers from ten to twenty takes place by adding the 3d person plural number present indicative *lika* (from *likù* s. *liekmi*); scil., the tenth remains undisturbed with the simple number, e.g. one, two, &c.; which addition, however, in composition degenerates into a declinable noun of the feminine gender, according to which, also, the preceding

"twelve," answers to the abovementioned Prâkṛit वारह *bâraha*, and, like this, has proceeded directly from the Sanskrit original form द्वादश *dvâdaśa*, without heeding the form of the simple *do*, "two," and *das*, "ten." It may be proper here to quote all the Hindûstânî compounds which belong to this subject, together with the corresponding Sanskrit words of which they are the corruptions. We annex, also, the number twenty, and nineteen which is related to it as being twenty less one, as also the simple lower numbers in Hindûstânî.

[G. Ed. p. 453.]

HINDÛSTÂNÎ.				SANSKRIT, NOMINATIVE.	
<i>ék</i>	1,	<i>igâ-rah</i>	- 11,	<i>ékâdaśa</i>	11.
<i>do</i>	2,	<i>bâ-rah</i>	12,	<i>dvâdaśa</i>	12.
<i>tîn</i>	3,	<i>têrah</i>	13,	<i>trayôdaśa</i>	13.
<i>châr</i>	4,	<i>chau-dah</i>	14,*	<i>chaturdaśa</i>	14.
<i>pâñch</i>	5,	<i>pand-rah</i>	15,	<i>pañchâdaśa</i>	15.
<i>chhah</i>	6,	<i>sô-lah</i>	16,†	<i>ṣhōḍaśa</i>	16.
<i>sât</i>	7,	<i>sat-rah</i>	17,	<i>saptadaśa</i>	17.
<i>âth</i>	8,	<i>aṭhâ-rah</i>	18,	<i>aṣṭâdaśa</i>	18.
<i>nau</i>	9,	<i>unnîs</i>	19,	<i>ânavinîśati</i> ("undeviginti")	19.
<i>das</i>	10,	<i>bîs</i>	20,	<i>vinîśati</i>	20.

320. XX—C. The idea of ten is expressed in Sanskrit by शति *śati*, शत *śat* or ति *ti*; in Zend by सائتي *śaiti*, सата *śata*, or ति *ti*; and the words therewith compounded are substantives with singular terminations, with which, in Sanskrit, the thing numbered agrees in case, as in apposition, or is put, as in the Zend, in the genitive, as

\* The retention of the *d* is here clearly to be ascribed to the circumstance that the lesser number ends with *r*, although in the Hindûstânî corruption this is no longer present. The Bengâlî has assimilated the *r* to the following *d*, hence *châuddo*; but, as a general rule, the Bengâlî in these compounds changes the *d* into *r*, and in all cases suppresses the Hindûstânî *h*; as *égâro*, "eleven," *bâro*, "twelve," *têro*, "thirteen."

† This form merits particular notice, as, through its *l* for the *r* found elsewhere, it comes so near to the Lithuanian and German *lika*, *lif*. The Bengâlî is *shôlo*.

subject,\* was not yet known to me, and which has been since then observed by Lenz in his edition of *Urvasi* (p. 219). In this dialect, then, the number ten is pronounced simply दह *daha*—approaching closely to the Gothic *taihun*—but at the end of the compounds under notice *raha*: *r* and *l*, however, are, according to §. 17., most intimately connected. Hitherto only, बारह *vāraha*, “twelve,” from द्वादश *dvādaśa*, and अष्टादह *aṣṭāraha*, “eighteen,” from अष्टादश *aṣṭādaśa*, can be cited, but still from them it is probable that the other numerals too, which fall under this cate- [G. Ed. p. 452.] gory, have an *r* for *d*, apparently to lighten the word loaded by the prefixing of lesser numbers, by exchanging the *d* for a weak semi-vowel. Now it is a remarkable coincidence that if we were desirous of not seeing a mutation of letters in this *raha* we should be led to the root *rah*, “to leave,” which is probably identical with the verb, to which recourse has been had for the explanation of the corresponding Lithuanian and German numeral forms.† I thought I had exhausted this subject, when I was led by other reasons to the Hindūstānī grammar, where I was agreeably surprised by perceiving that here, also, the number ten, in the designation of eleven, twelve, &c., has taken another lighter form than in its simple state, in which it is pronounced *das*.‡ But in the compounds under discussion this becomes *rah*,§ and, for example, *bārah*,

\* Influence of the Pronoun on the formation of Words, p. 27; and *Histor. Philol. Trans. of the Academy for the year 1833*, p. 178, &c.

† The *a* of *rah* has been weakened in the cognate languages to *i*: hence *linguo*, Lithuanian *likū*, Greek *λείπω* (*ἐλπινω*), Gothic *af-lif-na*. In respect to the consonants, we refer the reader to §§ 20. 23.: remark, also, the connection of the Lithuanian *laka*, “I lick,” with the Sanskrit root *lih*, “to lick.” Since writing this note, I have come to the conclusion that it is better to concur with Bensey, in assigning the Latin *linguo*, Greek *λείπω*, Gothic *af-lif-na*, to the Skr. root *rich*, from *rikh*, “to leave.”

‡ The text has *des* and *reh*, but as these sounds are incorrect, I have altered them, as well as some other inaccuracies in the Hindūstānī numerals which follow.—Translator.

in Lithuanian and Slavonic, already containe simple *deszimt's*, *deszimtis*, Old Slavonic *desyā* regard, however, to the ten being expressed abbreviation in the languages mentioned, in c also—as in Lithuanian *dvideszimti* (or *tis*), *trysdeszimti* (or *tis*), “thirty,” and in Old Sla *tyridesyaty*, “forty,”\* *pyatydesyaty*, “fifty”—I do not

[G. Ed. p. 455.] this as a more true retention of form, but as a new formation. The Lithuanian, forty upwards, separates the two numbers, and former in the feminine plural, e.g. *keturios deszimtės*, *penkios deszimtis*, “fifty”; in which it is su *deszimtis*, also, does not stand in the plural. This method in this numeral category is of comparatively recent date: it has lost, as in thirteen, &c., the compound, and gives, in the numbers under (sixty does not occur), *tigūs*, masculine, as the *e* for ten, and declines this, and in twenty, thirty, number also, with regular plural terminations: the accusatives *tvanstigūns*, *thrinstigūns*, *fidvōrtigūns*, the genitive *thriņjētigvė*. The substantive *tigūs*, has the etymological quaver to *taihun*, and *LIBI*: it to the former essentially, the aspirate having medial (see §. 89.), thus rendering the *a*, which, is brought in by the rule of sound mentioned is superfluous. Advert, also, to the Latin medials *ginta*, contrasted with the Greek *κατι, κοντα*, which better to *δέκα*. *Tigu-s* may be identical with skrit ordinal *daśa*, nominative masculine *daśa-* occurs only in compounds, as *dvādaśa-s*, “the To this *daśa-s*, therefore, is related *tigu-s* in its *u*, as *fōtu-s* to *pāda-s*, “a foot.” In the seventy, eighty, and ninety, ten is denoted by th

---

\* Twenty and thirty do not occur.



in the cognate languages, have in the earliest periods lost the initial syllable of the number ten, and with it the lingual remembrance of the same; and that in *विंशति* *viṁśati*, *ῥῑσῑτι* *vīśaiti*, *εἴκατι*, *εἴκοσι*, *viginti*, the single elements have lain together undisturbed for thousands of years, affords a fresh proof of the agreement of the languages which have most faithfully preserved their ancient construction. I would not, however, wish to maintain that the loss of the *d* of the number two in the above forms falls under the period of the unity of languages; and that it may not have happened that each of the four individual languages, having become weary of the initial double consonant in a word already encumbered by composition, may have disburthened itself of the initial sound, as we have above seen the Latin and Zend, independently of each other, produce *bis* from *dwis*, and *bi* from *dwi*, and as, in agreement with the abbreviation of *विंशति* *viṁśati*, the Prākṛit dialect mentioned at p. 451 G. ed. has laid aside the *d* in the number twelve also (*vāraha* for *dwārcha*). It is remarkable that the four oldest and most perfect languages of the Indō-European family in the category of numerals before us, have lost exactly as much of the number ten as the French in the forms for eleven, twelve, &c.; and the *ze* of *douze* is therefore identical with the Sanskrit *śa* of *विंशति* *viṁśati*. The *vo* Sanskrit and Zend, however, in a later corruption which is unsupported by the Greek and Latin, have caused the word *daśati* to be melted down to the derivation suffix *ti*, and this *ti* corresponds to the French *te* of *trente*, *quarante*, &c. The numbers which have been thus far abbreviated begin, in Sanskrit and Zend, with sixty, *षट्* *ṣaṣṭi* (*ti* euphonic for *ti*), *ῥῑषῑति* *ṣvasti*. To the *śati* of *विंशति* *viṁśati* *ῥῑσῑति* *vīśati*, regularly corresponds the Doric *κατι* of *εἴκατι*, while in the Latin *ginti* the smooth [G. Ed. p. 457.] letter has sunk to a medial, as in *ginta* = *κοιντα* of the higher numbers. In Sanskrit the *ni* of *viṁśati*,

substantive *têhund* (theme *TEHUNDA*, genitive *têhundī-s*); hence *sibun-têhund*, "seventy," *ahtau-têhund*, "eighty," *niun-têhund*, "ninety." The *ê* of this *TEHUNDA* stands as the representative of the *ai* of *taihun*, and I hold *DA* to be the ordinal suffix, which has introduced into the common ordinals another unorganic *N*, or, according to Grimm, follows the weak declension; hence *TAIHUNDAN*, nominative *taihunda*, "*decimus*." Hereby, then, it becomes still more probable that the abovementioned *tigus* also is originally an ordinal number. In our New German this word has transformed itself to *zig* or *ssig* (*dreissig*), and is found also in *siebenzig*, *achtzig*, *neunzig*, Old High German *sibunzog*, *ahtozog*, *niunzog*, or *-zoc*, and *zêhanzog* (*zoc*), Gothic *taihuntêhund*, "a hundred." The Sanskrit-Zend *śata*, "a hundred," which is a neuter substantive—nominative शतम् *śatam*, ὄρεσας *śatēm*—in my opinion owes its designation to the number ten (*daśan*), whence it is formed by the suffix *ta*—the suppression of the final nasal is regular;—so that it is to be regarded as an abbreviation of *daśata*, as above, शति *śati*, शत् *śat*, and the Zend ὄρεσας *śata* for *daśati*, &c. This abbreviation, however, which has given to the word the stamp of a primi- [G. Ed. p 456] tive expression specially created for the idea "a hundred," is proved to be of the highest antiquity by the consentaneous testimony of all the cognate languages, Greek κατόν (*ékaton* is, verbatim, "one hundred"), Latin *centum*, Lithuanian *szimta-s* (masculine), Old Slavonic *sto* (at once theme and nominative and accusative neuter).\* The Gothic *hund* and Old High German *hunt* (theme *HUNDA*, *HUNTA*) occur only in compounds, as *twa-hūnda*, *thria-hunda*, *zuei-hunt*, *driu-hunt*, where the lesser number is likewise inflected. That also शति *śati*, शत् *śat*, and the corresponding words

\* In Zend *śta* occurs frequently for *śata*, and just so in the numbers compounded therewith.





*triṇśat*, *chatvāriṇśat*, is surprising, and one might imagine a transposition of the nasal, so that in the Latin *ginti*, *ginta*, *centum*, and in the Gothic *HUNDA*, "one hundred," it would stand in its proper place. For the rest, *chatvāriṇśat* shews its relation to the neuter *chatuāri* (see §. 312.); as also *τρια*, *τεσσαρα* in *τριάκοντα*, *τεσσαράκοντα*, are, in my opinion, plural neuter forms, with the termination lengthened in *τριά*, and originally, also, in *τεσσαρα*, as\* the Ionic *τεσσαρήκοντα*, Doric *τετρώκοντα*,\* Latin *quadraginta*, prove. These forms excite the conjecture, that, in Sanskrit, the introduction of the nasal may, contrary to the explanation attempted above, have the same object that, in Greek, the lengthening of the termination has, namely, an emphatic repetition of the prefixed number, which is also perceptible in the long *i* of the Zend *vīśaiti*, as in the long *a* of *पञ्चाशद्* *pañchāśat*, *εξήκοντα* *pañchāśatēm* from *panchan* (§. 318.), and to which again the length of *πεντήκοντα*, *quinquaginta*, runs parallel. The Zend *chathuarē*, in *αρμωξλωσάτα* *chathuarēśata*, "forty" (Vend. S. p. 390), is likewise stronger than *cha-thru-śata*, which might have been expected from §. 312. As *αρμω* *śata* is a neuter, to which, in Greek, *κατον* or *κοντον* would correspond, *κοντα* therefore, and the Latin *ginta*, are best explained as neuters in the plural, by which the neuter nature of *τριά* and *τεσσαρα* is still more authenticated. An auxiliary vowel, which merely facilitated the combination, and which might be assumed in *ἐξήκοντα*, would at least be very superfluous in the theme *TPI*; and it is much more probable that *ἐξη*, too, is a lengthened plural neuter. Compare *ἐξά-κισ*, *ἐξαπλοῦς*, and the remarks on *πάντα* and *πολλά*, p. 401, G. ed.

---

\* The *ω* for *ā* is explained by §. 4. As to the suppression of the vowel before the *ρ*, *τετρω* answers to *τετρα* in *τετράκισ*, *τετραπλοῦς*, which in like manner are based on plural neuter forms instead of the theme.

[G. Ed. p. 460.] *simus, trigesimus*, as in Sanskrit *viṃśatitama-s*, *triṃśattama-s*.\* In Latin, however, the termination *nti* or *nta* of the primitives is rejected, and in compensation the preceding vowel is lengthened in the form of *ē*. Compare, in this respect, the comparative formations discussed in §. 298. The Greek shews its more rare superlative suffix, corresponding to the Sanskrit *इष्ठ* *ishtha*, in the ordinal numbers like *εἰκοστός, τριακοστός*, with the loss of the *ι* of *ιστός*, as in *ἑκαστός, πόστος*. Here also, therefore, as in Latin, the *τι, σι*, and *ντα* of the cardinal number are rejected. The German languages employ in like manner the superlative suffix in numbers from twenty upwards: hence, Old High German *drī-zugōsto*, “the thirtieth,” *fior-zugōsto*, “the fortieth”: but in the numbers from four to nineteen the *TAN* or *DAN*, in Gothic, corresponds, according to the measure of the preceding letter (§. 91.), to the suffix of the cognate languages, as in *चतुर्थस् chaturtha-s*, *τέταρτο-s*, *quartu-s*, *ketwir-la-s*. The *N*, however, is an unorganic addition, after the principle of the indefinite adjective declension (§. 285.), which is followed by the ordinal numbers, with the exception of 1 and 2 in the older dialects; while the New German has also introduced the definite—*vierter*, “fourth,” *fünfter*, “fifth,” &c.; hence, Gothic *FIMFTAN*, nom. masc. *fimfta*.†

[G. Ed. p. 461.] 322. From the weakened base *द्वि* *dwi* “two” (p. 424), and from the *त्रि* *tri*, “three,” contracted to *तृ* *tri*, the Sanskrit forms the ordinal numbers by a suffix *तृया*; hence *dwi-tṛya-s*, *tri-tṛya-s*. This suffix is easily recognised in the Latin *ter-*

\* However, this and the higher numbers may follow the analogy of *ἐκάδα-s*, “the eleventh”; hence, also, *viṃśa*, *triṃśa*, &c. In Zend I am unable to quote the ordinal numbers from twenty upwards.

† In compounds like *fimftataihunda*, “the fifteenth,” the lesser number has either preserved the original theme while still free from the *n*, which was added more lately,—for the lesser number in these compounds does not partake of declension,—or *fimfta* is here the regular abbreviation of the theme *FIMFTAN*, since, as I have already elsewhere remarked (Berl. Ann. May 1827. p. 759), bases in *n*, in strict accordance with the Sanskrit, drop the *n* in the beginning of compounds.

that also *𑂣𑂗𑂢𑂰* *pug-dhō*, "the fifth," belongs more to the European cognate languages, in which it comes nearest to the Lithuanian *penk-ta-s*. The Lithuanian, however, is more true to the original form, as its sister, the Zend, has softened two original smooth letters, as [G. Ed. p. 459.] in Greek, *πεντος* for *πεντος*; and, besides this, has aspirated the last, rejected the nasal (comp. p. 94, *bastā* from *bandh*), and irregularly changed the *a* to *u*, as in "ONYX, corresponding to the Sanskrit *नख* *naḥha*, "a nail." In the numbers from eleven to twenty the superlative suffix, in Sanskrit and Zend, is abbreviated still more than in the simple दशम *daśama*, *𑂣𑂗𑂢𑂰𑂣𑂗𑂢𑂰* *daśēma*, and of all the derivational suffix only the *a* is left, before which the *a* of the primitive word must fall away, according to a universal principle for the derivation of words; as, द्वादश *duā-daśa*, *𑂣𑂗𑂢𑂰𑂣𑂗𑂢𑂰* *dvadaśa*, "the twelfth"; चतुर्दश *chaturdaśa*, *𑂣𑂗𑂢𑂰𑂣𑂗𑂢𑂰𑂣𑂗𑂢𑂰* *chathrudāśa*, "the fourteenth." The Latin appears to prove that this abbreviation is comparatively of recent date, and it goes beyond both the Asiatic sisters by its *undecimus*, *duodecimus*, not *undecus*, *duodecus*; but has, as it were, exhausted itself in the effort which the continuance of these heavier forms has cost it; and has given up the analogous formations in the very place in which the German cardinal numbers have lost the old compound in *lf*: hence, *tertius decimus* for the lost *tredecimus*, &c. An imitation, however, of the abbreviation which we have just remarked in the Sanskrit-Zend *daśa* is supplied by the Greek and Latin in the forms *octav-us*, *ὄγδο(Ϝ)-ος*, where, of the ordinal suffix, in like manner, only the final vowel is left: we might have expected *ὄγδομος*, *octomus*. In the very remarkable coincidence which here exists between the said languages, it must seem strange that, in the remaining designations of the ordinal numbers, the Latin is a much truer colleague to its Asiatic sisters than to the Greek; and it preserves this character, also, in annexing, from twenty upwards, the full superlative suffix *simu-s* (from *timu-s* = *तमस्* *tama-s*); thus *vicesimus* or *vige-*



*lius*, as also in the Old Slavonic *trelīi*, fem. *trelīya*, which, like all the ordinal numbers, has only a definite declension, in which, however, the particular case occurs, that the defining element is brought with it direct from the East, while the *tyi* of *chetyertyi* and others, in which, in like manner, a connection with तीय *tīya* might be easily conjectured, is, in fact, connected with the च *tho*, TO, TU of चतुर्थे *chaturtha*, τέταρτος, *quartus*, and has arisen from the indefinite theme in TO (comp. the collective *chetrero*, §. 312.), according to §. 255. (d.), although the simple word in most of the formations falling under this category no longer exists. The same relation, then, that *chetyertyi*, *shestyi*, have to *chaturtha-s*, *shoshthas*, *sedmyi*, *osmyi*, have to सप्तम *saptamo*, अष्टम *aṣṭoma*; and *perryi*, "the first," to पूर्व *pūrva*, "the former;" which expressions, in Slavonic, remain only in combination with the pronominal base *ŕO* (§. 282.). The Zend has rejected the *i* of the suffix *tīya*, and abbreviated *divi* to *bi*; henceo *bitya*, *thritya*, in which it is to be remarked that the *y*, which is thus by syncope united with the *t* at a comparatively later period, has gained no aspirating influence (§. 47.). To this Zend *tya* corresponds, by similar suppression of the middle *i*, the Gothic *DYAN* (from *dya*, §. 283.) in *THRIDYAN*, nom. masc. *thridya*, the *y* of which in the Old High German *drillo*, has assimilated itself to the preceding *t*, in analogy with the Prākṛit forms and Greek comparatives, like θάσσων, κρείσσων, κρείττων, mentioned at p. 402. Still closer, however, lies the comparison with διττός, τριττός (δισσός, τρισσός), which are evidently, in [G. Id. p. 462.] their origin, one with the corresponding Sanskrit-Zend ordinal numbers; and, in respect of their reduplicated consonant, have the same relation thereto that the Old High German *drillo* has to the Gothic *thriyda*. Regarding *tvoddyē*, "duorum," see p. 422, Note \*: the place of the ordinal number is supplied by the pronoun *anthar* (see p. 377), Old High German *andor*, Middle High German *ander*. Our *zweiter*, however, is a new inorganic formation. The Old Slavonic *vtoryi* (see §. 297.)

The Greek forms in *κῖς* like *τετράκις*, *πεντάκις*, &c., in regard to their suffix, do not belong to this class, but *κῖς* answers to the Sanskrit *śas* (§. 21.), the *a* being weakened to *i*; this *śas*, however, forms adverbs from words which express a great number, multitude or number, as *śataśas*, "by hundreds," *sahasraśas*, "by thousands," *bahuśas*, "of many kinds," *gaṇaśas*, "in swarms." The original idea of the suffix in both languages is that of repetition, but *e.g.* *śataśas* is an indefinite repetition of a hundred, while in *ἐκατοντάκις* the repetition is strictly defined by the numeral. How stands it, then, with the Latin forms like *quingies*, *sexies*, &c.? I believe that in respect to their suffix they are connected neither with the forms in *s* like *divis*, *δῖς*, nor with

[G. Ed. p. 465.] those in *κῖς* (*śas*), by suppression of the guttural; but as *toties*, *quoties*, evidently belong to this class, which are also pronounced *quotiens*, *totiens*, this probably being the more genuine form, as in Greek, in a similar case, *τιθέεις* is more genuine than *τιθείς* (§. 138.), I therefore prefer bringing these forms in *ens*, *es*, into conjunction with the Sanskrit suffix *vant* (in the weak cases *vat*), which signifies, in pronominal bases, "much," but elsewhere, "gifted with," and the nominative of which is, in Zend, *vañs*, *e.g.* *chvañs*, "how much," for *chivañs*. This suffix has, in Sanskrit, in combination with the interrogative base *ki*, and the demonstrative base *i*, laid aside the *v*; hence *kiy-ant*, *iy-ant*—weak form *kijat*, *iyat*—nominative masculine *kīyān*, *īyān*; this *ant* for *vant* answers therefore to the Greek ENT (nominative masculine *εις*), *e.g.* in *μελιτόεις*, and also to the Latin *ens*, in *totiens*, *quotiens*, which indeed are, in form, masculine nominatives, but must also be considered as neuters, as in the participles, too, in *nt*, the masculine nominative has forced its way into the neuter. Now comes the question whether we ought to divide *toti-ens* *quoti-ens*, or *tot-iens*, *quot-iens*? In the former case *tot*, *quot*, would have preserved, in this combination, the *i*

"Remark.—As the old *a* of the preposition *pr* *pra* has been weakened to *i*—as in *quinque*, answering to *panchan*—the Latin *prima* appears distinct from the preposition *pro*, and is decidedly not derived from a Roman soil, but is, as it were, the continuance of the Indian *prathamā*, the middle syllable being cast out. A similar weakening of the vowel is exhibited in the Greek adverb *πρίν*, which is hereby, in like manner, brought into connection with the preposition *πρό*. In the comparative *prior* only the *pr* of the preposition, which forms the base, is left, as the *i* belongs to the comparative suffix. In Lithuanian the *m* of the superlative formation has introduced itself also into the preposition *pirm*, 'before'; but the unaltered *pra* stands as prefix. To the same base, however, belongs also *pri*, 'by, before,' as well isolated as prefixed. The Gothic *fruma* shews the same relation to *prathamā* that the Latin [G. Ed. p. 464.] and Lithuanian do: the *u* of *fra* has arisen from *a* through the influence of the liquid (§. 66.). In the cognate preposition *fram*, 'before, by,' &c., the original vowel has remained, and in this form, as in the Lithuanian *pirm*, the superlative *m* is contained. On *pr* *pra* is based, also, *faur*, 'before,' with transposition of the *u* of *fru-ma*, and with *a* prefixed, according to §. 82.

## NUMERAL ADVERBS.

324. The adverbs which express the ideas "twice," "thrice," "four times," have been already discussed (p. 435, G. ed.). Let the following serve for a general view of them:—

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	OLD NORTHERN.
<i>dwis</i> ,	<i>bis</i> ,	<i>δίς</i> ,	<i>bis</i> ,	<i>twis-var</i> (p. 436 G. ed.).
<i>tris</i> ,	<i>thris</i> ,	<i>τρίς</i> ,	<i>ter</i> ,	<i>thris-var</i> .
<i>chatur</i> ,*	<i>chathrus</i> ,	....	<i>quater</i> ,	....

\* According to §. 94. for *chatur*s.



also, the number ten, in compounds like *on-ze*, *dou-ze*, *trei-ze*, is so remote from the expression of the simple ten, that one would hardly venture to pronounce the syllable *ze* to be *nkiu*, or originally identical with *dix*, if it were not historically certain that *onze*, *douze*, &c., have arisen from *undecim*, *duodecim*, and that therefore *ze* is a corruption of *decim*, as *dix* is a less vitiated form of *decem*. If, then, *onze*, *douze*, &c., have assumed the appearance of uncompounded words through the great alteration of the expression for the number ten contained in them, the same holds good with regard to our *eîf* and *zuôlf*, in which, perhaps, as in *onze* and *douze*, a connection with *ein* and *zwei* may be recognised, but none with *zehn*; and in the English *eleven*, also, the relation to one is entirely obliterated. But with regard to our using for thirteen, fourteen, &c., not *dreîf*, *vierf*, or similar forms in *f*, but *dreizehn*, *vierzehn*, &c., in which *zehn* is just as unaltered as the *drei* and *vier*, this arises from the Germans having forgotten the old Indo-European compounds for these numbers, and then having compacted the necessary expressions anew from the elements as they exist uncompounded. Nay, even [G. Ed. p. 449] the Greek has reconstructed afresh, as well as it could, its numerals from thirteen upwards, after that the old more genuine compounds had fallen into disuse; but this has been done, I must say, in a clumsy, awkward fashion, by which the addition of a particle signifying *and* was found requisite in an attempt at extreme perspicuity, while *ἐνδεκα*, *δῶδεκα*, move more freely, and are suited to the spirit of the ancient compounds. The literal meaning, too, of *τρισκαίδεκα* (for *τρίδεκα*) is "thrice and ten," and the numeral adverb *τρίς*, instead of the bare theme *τρι*, is here just as much a mistake as the masculine plural nominative serves as a reproach to the *τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα*, and is inferior in purity to the Sanskrit *chatur-dāśan*, not *chatvâras-dāśan* (*chatvârô-dāśan*). On the other hand, the Sanskrit, in the designation of the number

thirteen, commits a similar error, and awkwardly gives instead of *tri-daśan*, *trayô-daśan*—cuphonic for *trayas-daśan*—where the masculine plural nominative instead of the theme, which is adapted for all genders, is not well selected. The Latin *tre-decim* is therefore a more pure formation, as it dispenses with a case-sign in the first member of the compound: just so the Lithuanian *try-lika*, not *trys-lika*. This *lika*, which concludes the form, in all Lithuanian adding numerals (eleven to nineteen), exchanges the old *d* for *l*, as in German, and is therefore as far estranged from the simple *deszint*'s as the Gothic *libi* from *taihun*; partly, as the second consonant in *lika* has maintained itself in its oldest form received from the Greek, and has not become a sibilant; so that *lika* and *δέκα* resemble each other very closely. The Lithuanian *lika*, therefore, is derived, like the Gothic *libi* and the French *ze* in *onze*, *douze*, &c., from the old compound which has been handed down, and cannot, therefore, be censured for its want of agreement with the simple number ten: it is no longer conscious of its meaning, and, like an inanimate corpse, is carried by the living inferior number. As, however, the smaller number in these compounds is still living, so that in the feeling of the speaker the numbers *wieno-lika*, *dwy-lika*, &c., do not appear as independent simple designations of numbers—ās, perhaps, *septyni* is felt to be independent of each of the earlier numbers—so, naturally, in these compounds the first member has kept tolerably equal pace with the form which it shews in its isolated state; on which account *wieno-lika*, if it is regarded as an ancient compound from the time of the unity of language, or perhaps as derived from *एकादशन्* *ēkā-daśan*, [G. Ed. p. 450.] has nevertheless undergone, in its initial member, a renovation; as also in Gothic *ainlif*, in Greek *ἐνδεκα*, in Latin *undecim*, have regulated their first member according to the form which is in force for the isolated number one. On the other hand, *δῶδεκα* is almost entirely the Sanskrit *dvā-daśa*

( $\omega$  for  $\acute{\alpha}$ , according to §. 4.), and is as similar to it as possible, as  $\upsilon$  ( $F$ ) in Greek cannot be pronounced after consonants, and in the first syllable, also, could not assimilate itself to the preceding consonant (compare  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\varsigma$  from  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ ), for  $\delta\delta\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$  could not be uttered. In Latin, *duodecim* has formed its first member exactly after the simple form: on the other hand, the French has paid no regard to the form in which the preceding number appears in its isolated state, but has left the composition entirely in the old form, only with the abbreviations which time has by degrees introduced. With reference to the isolated state of the smaller number, it would have been, perhaps, necessary in French to have said *unze*, *deuze*, *troize*, &c. After what has been stated, I think no one can any longer doubt, that in our *eilf* (*elf*) and *zwölf*, strange as it at the first glance may appear, a word is contained expressing the number ten, and identical in its origin with *daśan*,  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha$ , and *zehn*. If, however, the older *LIBI*, *lif*, and Lithuanian *lika*, be regarded without the suspicion arising, that in them corrupt though very common permutations of sounds may have preceded, then one would propose in Lithuanian a root *lik*, and in Gothic *lif* or *lib* (Gothic *af-lifnan*, "*relinqui, superesse*," *laibós*, "*reliquiæ*"), which both signify "to remain," and are also connected with each other and with the Greek  $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omega$  ( $\Lambda\text{I}\Pi$ ). Grimm, who has recognised (II. 946) the original identity of our *lif* and the Lithuanian *lika*, has perhaps allowed himself to be led astray by Ruhig in the meaning of these expressions, and deduces the latter from *likti*, "*linqui, remanere*," the former from *leiban*, "*manere*." Ruhig, according to Mielcke, p. 58, holds *lika* for the 3d person plural, since he says, "Composition in the cardinal numbers from ten to twenty takes place by adding the 3d person plural number present indicative *lika* (from *likù* s. *liekmi*); scil., the tenth remains undisturbed with the simple number, e.g. one, two, &c.; which addition, however, in composition degenerates into a declinable noun of the feminine gender, according to which, also, the preceding

[G. Ed. p. 451.] simple number must be regulated.\* The languages, however, do not proceed so pedantically; and if they hold any thing understood, as very commonly happens, they do not expressly state that any thing remains over to be expressed. It is certain, however, that the Slavonic languages, in their expressions for eleven to twenty, do not keep back any thing to be understood, but form those expressions, after the loss of the old, no longer intelligible compounds, anew, with the annexed preposition *na*, "over"; e.g. in Old Slavonic, where the numbers eleven, twelve, thirteen, no longer occur, *chetyri-na-desyaty*, "four over ten." The ordinal numbers for eleven and twelve are *yedinyĩ-na-desyaty*, "the first over ten," *vtoryĩ-na-desyaty*, "the second over ten." In the same manner proceeds the twin sister of the Lithuanian—accompanying it, but corrupted—the Lettish, in which *weenpazmit* signifies "eleven," as it appears to me, with contraction of the *d(e)s* of *desmit*, "ten," to *z*, and overleaping the *e*. This procedure in Lettish has no doubt originated from the older *lika* being no longer intelligible. If it was to be so understood, as Ruhig has taken it, its form would be palpable, and the Lettians might have been satisfied with it. With reference to the composition of the numerals under discussion, there remains to be noticed a most remarkable coincidence of the Lithuanian and German with a Prâkṛit dialect, which coincidence, when I formerly touched upon this

---

\* Grimm's view is certainly much more natural, "ten and one over, two over." Only it would be to be expected, if the language wished to designate the numbers eleven and twelve as that which they contain more than ten, that they would have selected for combination with one and two a word which signifies "and over, or more," and not an exponent of the idea "to leave," "to remain." It would, moreover, be more adapted to the genius and custom of the later periods of the language, not to forget the number ten in the newly-formed compounds, like the Lettish and Slavonic. J. Grimm, in his "History of the German Language," p. 246, agrees with my explanation of *eilf*, *zwölf*, and analogous forms in Lith. and Slavonic.

subject,\* was not yet known to me, and which has been since then observed by Lenz in his edition of *Urvasi* (p. 219). In this dialect, then, the number ten is pronounced simply दह *daha*—approaching closely to the Gothic *taihun*—but at the end of the compounds under notice *raha*: *r* and *l*, however, are, according to §. 17., most intimately connected. Hitherto only, बारह *vāraha*, “twelve,” from द्वादश *dwādaśa*, and अट्ठारह *aṭṭhāraha*, “eighteen,” from अष्टादश *aṣṭādaśa*, can be cited, but still from them it is probable that the other numerals too, which fall under this cate-

gory, have an *r* for *d*, apparently to lighten the word loaded by the prefixing of lesser numbers, by exchanging the *d* for a weak semi-vowel. Now it is a remarkable coincidence that if we were desirous of not seeing a mutation of letters in this *raha* we should be led to the root *rah*, “to leave,” which is probably identical with the verb, to which recourse has been had for the explanation of the corresponding Lithuanian and German numeral forms.† I thought I had exhausted this subject, when I was led by other reasons to the Hindūstānī grammar, where I was agreeably surprised by perceiving that here, also, the number ten, in the designation of eleven, twelve, &c., has taken another lighter form than in its simple state, in which it is pronounced *das*.‡ But in the compounds under discussion this becomes *rah*,§ and, for example, *bārah*,

\* Influence of the Pronoun on the formation of Words, p. 27; and Histor. Philol. Trans. of the Academy for the year 1833, p. 178, &c.

† The *a* of *rah* has been weakened in the cognate languages to *i*: hence *linguo*, Lithuanian *likū*, Greek *λείπω* (*ἔλιπον*), Gothic *af-lif-na*. In respect to the consonants, we refer the reader to §§ 20. 23.: remark, also, the connection of the Lithuanian *laku*, “I lick,” with the Sanskrit root *lih*, “to lick.” Since writing this note, I have come to the conclusion that it is better to concur with Bensey, in assigning the Latin *linguo*, Greek *λείπω*, Gothic *af-lif-na*, to the Skt. root *rich*, from *rikh*, “to leave.”

‡ The text has *des* and *reh*, but as these sounds are incorrect, I have altered them, as well as some other inaccuracies in the Hindūstānī numerals which follow.—Translator.

“twelve,” answers to the abovementioned Prākṛit चारह *bāraha*, and, like this, has proceeded directly from the Sanskrit original form द्वादश *dvādaśa*, without heeding the form of the simple *do*, “two,” and *das*, “ten.” It may be proper here to quote all the Hindūstānī compounds which belong to this subject, together with the corresponding Sanskrit words of which they are the corruptions. We annex, also, the number twenty, and nineteen which is related to it as being twenty less one, as also the simple lower numbers in Hindūstānī.

[G. Ed. p. 453.]

HINDŪSTĀNĪ.				SANSKRIT, NOMINATIVE.	
<i>ék</i>	1,	<i>igā-rah</i> ,	- 11,	<i>ékādaśa</i>	11.
<i>do</i>	2,	<i>bā-rah</i>	12,	<i>dvādaśa</i>	12.
<i>tīn</i>	3,	<i>tērah</i>	13,	<i>trayōdaśa</i>	13.
<i>chār</i>	4,	<i>chau-dah</i>	14,*	<i>chaturdaśa</i>	14.
<i>pānch</i>	5,	<i>pand-rah</i>	15,	<i>pañchādaśa</i>	15.
<i>chhah</i>	6,	<i>sō-lah</i>	16,†	<i>ṣhōḍaśa</i>	16.
<i>sāt</i>	7,	<i>sat-rah</i>	17,	<i>saptadaśa</i>	17.
<i>āth</i>	8,	<i>aṭhā-rah</i>	18,	<i>aṣṭādaśa</i>	18.
<i>nau</i>	9,	<i>unnīs</i>	19,	<i>ānaviṁśati</i> (“undeviginti”)	19.
<i>das</i>	10,	<i>bīs</i>	20,	<i>viṁśati</i>	20.

320. XX—C. The idea of ten is expressed in Sanskrit by शति *śati*, शत् *śat* or ति *ti*; in Zend by 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 *šaiti*, 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 *šata*, or 𐬰𐬀 *ti*; and the words therewith compounded are substantives with singular terminations, with which, in Sanskrit, the thing numbered agrees in case, as in apposition, or is put, as in the Zend, in the genitive, as

\* The retention of the *d* is here clearly to be ascribed to the circumstance that the lesser number ends with *r*, although in the Hindūstānī corruption this is no longer present. The Bengālī has assimilated the *r* to the following *d*, hence *chāuddo*; but, as a general rule, the Bengālī in these compounds changes the *d* into *r*, and in all cases suppresses the Hindūstānī *h*; as *égāro*, “eleven,” *bāro*, “twelve,” *tēro*, “thirteen.”

† This form merits particular notice, as, through its *l* for the *r* found elsewhere, it comes so near to the Lithuanian and German *lika*, *lif*. The Bengālī is *shōlo*.



in Lithuanian and Slavonic, already containe simple *deszimt's*, *deszimtis*, Old Slavonic *desy* regard, however, to the ten being expressed abbreviation in the languages mentioned, in c also—as in Lithuanian *dvideszimti* (or *tis*), *trysdeszimti* (or *tis*), “thirty,” and in Old Sla *tyridesyaty*, “forty,”\* *pyatydesyaty*, “fifty”—I do not  
 [G. Ed. p. 455.] this as a more true retention of form, but as a new formation. The Lithuanian, forty upwards, separates the two numbers, and former in the feminine plural, e.g. *keturios deszimti penkios deszimtis*, “fifty”; in which it is su *deszimtis*, also, does not stand in the plural. The method in this numeral category is of com recent date: it has lost, as in thirteen, &c., the compound, and gives, in the numbers under (sixty does not occur), *tigus*, masculine, as the e for ten, and declines this, and in twenty, thirty, number also, with regular plural terminations: accusatives *tvanstiguns*, *thrinstiguns*, *fidvórtiguns*, genitive *thriyétigvė*. The substantive *tigus*, h the etymological quaver to *taihun*, and *LIBI*: it to the former essentially, the aspirate having medial (see §. 89.), thus rendering the *a*, which, is brought in by the rule of sound mentioned i superfluous. Advert, also, to the Latin medials *ginta*, contrasted with the Greek *κατι, κοντα*, which better to *δέκα*. *Tigu-s* may be identical with skrit ordinal *daśa*, nominative masculine *daśa-* occurs only in compounds, as *duśadaśa-s*, “the To this *daśa-s*, therefore, is related *tigu-s* in its *u*, as *fótu-s* to *pāda-s*, “a foot.” In the seventy, eighty, and ninety, ten is denoted by th

---

\* Twenty and thirty do not occur.



substantive *têhund* (theme *TEHUNDA*, genitive *têhund-s*); hence *sibun-têhund*, "seventy," *ahtau-têhund*, "eighty," *niun-têhund*, "ninety." The *ê* of this *TEHUNDA* stands as the representative of the *ai* of *taihun*, and I hold *DA* to be the ordinal suffix, which has introduced into the common ordinals another unorganic *N*, or, according to Grimm, follows the weak declension; hence *TAIHUNDAN*, nominative *taihunda*, "*decimus*." Hereby, then, it becomes still more probable that the abovementioned *tigus* also is originally an ordinal number. In our New German this word has transformed itself to *zig* or *ssig* (*dreissig*), and is found also in *siebenzig*, *achtzig*, *neunzig*, Old High German *sibunzog*, *ahtozog*, *niunzog*, or *-zoc*, and *zêhanzog* (*zoc*), Gothic *taihuntêhund*, "a hundred." The Sanskrit-Zend *śata*, "a hundred," which is a neuter substantive—nominative *शतम् śatam*, *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ śatēm*—in my opinion owes its designation to the number ten (*daśan*), whence it is formed by the suffix *ta*—the suppression of the final nasal is regular;—so that it is to be regarded as an abbreviation of *daśata*, as above, *शति śati*, *शत् śat*, and the Zend *𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 śata* for *daśati*, &c. This abbreviation, however, which has given to the word the stamp of a primi- [G. Ed. p 456] tive expression specially created for the idea "a hundred," is proved to be of the highest antiquity by the consentaneous testimony of all the cognate languages, Greek *κατόν* (*ἐκατόν* is, verbatim, "one hundred"), Latin *centum*, Lithuanian *szimta-s* (masculine), Old Slavonic *sto* (at once theme and nominative and accusative neuter).\* The Gothic *hund* and Old High German *hunt* (theme *HUNDA*, *HUNTA*) occur only in compounds, ns *tva-hūnda*, *thria-hunda*, *zuei-hunt*, *driu-hunt*, where the lesser number is likewise inflected. That also *शति śati*, *शत् śat*, and the corresponding words

\* In Zend *śta* occurs frequently for *śata*, and just so in the numbers compounded therewith.

in the cognate languages, have in the earliest periods lost the initial syllable of the number ten, and with it the lingual remembrance of the same; and that in विंशति *vinśati*, ὀξωκισσάτις *vīśaiti*, εἴκατι, εἴκοσι, *viginti*, the single elements have lain together undisturbed for thousands of years, affords a fresh proof of the agreement of the languages which have most faithfully preserved their ancient construction. I would not, however, wish to maintain that the loss of the *d* of the number two in the above forms falls under the period of the unity of languages; and that it may not have happened that each of the four individual languages, having become weary of the initial double consonant in a word already encumbered by composition, may have disburthened itself of the initial sound, as we have above seen the Latin and Zend, independently of each other, produce *bis* from *dwis*, and *bi* from *dwi*, and as, in agreement with the abbreviation of विंशति *vinśati*, the Prākṛit dialect mentioned at p. 451 G. ed. has laid aside the *d* in the number twelve also (*vāraha* for *dwāracha*). It is remarkable that the four oldest and most perfect languages of the Indo-European family in the category of numerals before us, have lost exactly as much of the number ten as the French in the forms for eleven, twelve, &c.; and the *ze* of *douze* is therefore identical with the Sanskrit *śa* of विंशति *vinśati*. The *vo* Sanskrit and Zend, however, in a later corruption which is unsupported by the Greek and Latin, have caused the word *daśati* to be melted down to the derivation suffix *ti*, and this *ti* corresponds to the French *te* of *trente*, *quarante*, &c. The numbers which have been thus far abbreviated begin, in Sanskrit and Zend, with sixty, षष्टि *ṣaṣṭhi* (*ti*-aphonic for *ti*), ὅξωκισσάστις *cšvasti*. To the *śati* of विंशति *vinśati* ὀξωκισσάτις *vīśati*, regularly corresponds the Doric κατή of εἴκατη, while in the Latin *ginti* the smooth [G. Ed. p. 457.] letter has sunk to a medial, as in *ginta*=*κόντα* of the higher numbers. In Sanskrit the *n* of *vinśati*,

*triṅśat*, *chatvāriṅśat*, is surprising, and one might imagine a transposition of the nasal, so that in the Latin *ginti*, *ginta*, *centum*, and in the Gothic *HUNDA*, "one hundred," it would stand in its proper place. For the rest, *chatvāriṅśat* shows its relation to the neuter *chatuāri* (see §. 312.); as also *τρια*, *τεσσαρα* in *τριάκοντα*, *τεσσαράκοντα*, are, in my opinion, plural neuter forms, with the termination lengthened in *τρια*, and originally, also, in *τεσσαρα*, as\* the Ionic *τεσσαρήκοντα*, Doric *τετρώκοντα*,\* Latin *quadraginta*, prove. These forms excite the conjecture, that, in Sanskrit, the introduction of the nasal may, contrary to the explanation attempted above, have the same object that, in Greek, the lengthening of the termination has, namely, an emphatic repetition of the prefixed number, which is also perceptible in the long *i* of the Zend *vīśaiti*, as in the long *a* of पञ्चाशद् *pañchāśat*, *ἑξήκοντα* *hexēkōnta* *pañchāśatēm* from *panchan* (§. 318.), and to which again the length of πενήκοντα, *quinquaginta*, runs parallel. The Zend *chathuarē*, in *ἑκατηνάρη* *chathuarēśata*, "forty" (Vend. S. p. 390), is likewise stronger than *cha-thru-śata*, which might have been expected from §. 312. As *ἑκατηνάρη* *śata* is a neuter, to which, in Greek, *κατον* or *κοντον* would correspond, *κοντα* therefore, and the Latin *ginta*, are best explained as neuters in the plural, by which the neuter nature of *τρια* and *τεσσαρα* is still more authenticated. An auxiliary vowel, which merely facilitated the combination, and which might be assumed in *ἐξήκοντα*, would at least be very superfluous in the theme TPI; and it is much more probable that *ἐξη*, too, is a lengthened plural neuter. Compare *ἐξά-κισ*, *ἐξαπλοῦς*, and the remarks on *πάντα* and *πολλά*, p. 401, G. ed.

---

\* The *ω* for *ä* is explained by §. 4. As to the suppression of the vowel before the *ρ*, *τετρω* answers to *τετρα* in *τετράκισ*, *τετραπλοῦς*, which in like manner are based on plural neuter forms instead of the theme.



that also *ਪ੍ਰਭੂ* *pug-dhō*, "the fifth," belongs more to the European cognate languages, in which it comes nearest to the Lithuanian *penk-ta-s*. The Lithuanian, however, is more true to the original form, as its sister, the Zend, has softened two original smooth letters, as [G. Ed. p. 459.] in Greek, *ὄγδοος* for *ὄκτοος*; and, besides this, has aspirated the last, rejected the nasal (comp. p. 94, *basta* from *bandh*), and irregularly changed the *a* to *u*, as in *ONYX*, corresponding to the Sanskrit *नख* *nakha*, "a nail." In the numbers from eleven to twenty the superlative suffix, in

\* Sanskrit and Zend, is abbreviated still more than in the simple *दशम* *daśama*, *द्विदशम* *daśēma*, and of all the derivational suffix only the *a* is left, before which the *a* of the primitive word must fall away, according to a universal principle for the derivation of words; as, *द्वादश* *duḍ-daśa*, *द्विदशम* *dvadaśa*, "the twelfth"; *चतुर्दश* *chaturdaśa*, *चतुर्दशम* *chathrudaśa*, "the fourteenth." The Latin appears to prove that this abbreviation is comparatively of recent date, and it goes beyond both the Asiatic sisters by its *undecimus*, *duodecimus*, not *undecus*, *duodecus*; but has, as it were, exhausted itself in the effort which the continuance of these heavier forms has cost it; and has given up the analogous formations in the very place in which the German cardinal numbers have lost the old compound in *lif*: hence, *tertius decimus* for the lost *tredecimus*, &c. An imitation, however, of the abbreviation which we have just remarked in the Sanskrit-Zend *daśa* is supplied by the Greek and Latin in the forms *octav-us*, *ὄγδο(F)-ος*, where, of the ordinal suffix, in like manner, only the final vowel is left: we might have expected *ὄγδομος*, *octomus*. In the very remarkable coincidence which here exists between the said languages, it must seem strange that, in the remaining designations of the ordinal numbers, the Latin is a much truer colleague to its Asiatic sisters than to the Greek; and it preserves this character, also, in annexing, from twenty upwards, the full superlative suffix *simu-s* (from *limu-s* = *तमस्* *tama-s*); thus *vicesimus* or *vige-*

[G. Ed. p. 460.] *simus, trigesimus*, as in Sanskrit *viṃśatitama-s*, *triṃśattama-s*.\* In Latin, however, the termination *nti* or *nta* of the primitives is rejected, and in compensation the preceding vowel is lengthened in the form of *ē*. Compare, in this respect, the comparative formations discussed in §. 298. The Greek shews its more rare superlative suffix, corresponding to the Sanskrit *इष्ट* *iṣṭha*, in the ordinal numbers like *εἰκοστός, τριακοστός*, with the loss of the *ι* of *ιστός*, as in *ἑκαστός, πόστος*. Here also, therefore, as in Latin, the *τι, σι, and ντα* of the cardinal number are rejected. The German languages employ in like manner the superlative suffix in numbers from twenty upwards: hence, Old High German *drî-zugôsto*, “the thirtieth,” *fior-zugôsto*, “the fortieth”: but in the numbers from four to nineteen the *TAN* or *DAN*, in Gothic, corresponds, according to the measure of the preceding letter (§. 91.), to the suffix of the cognate languages, as in *चतुर्थेस्* *chaturtha-s*, *τέταρτο-ς*, *quartu-s*, *ketwir-la-s*. The *N*, however, is an unorganic addition, after the principle of the indefinite adjective declension (§. 285.), which is followed by the ordinal numbers, with the exception of 1 and 2 in the older dialects; while the New German has also introduced the definite—*vierter*, “fourth,” *fünfter*, “fifth,” &c.; hence, Gothic *FIMFTAN*, nom. masc. *fimfta*.†

[G. Ed. p. 461.] 322. From the weakened base *द्वि* *dwi* “two” (p. 424), and from the *त्रि* *tri*, “three,” contracted to *तृ* *tri*, the Sanskrit forms the ordinal numbers by a suffix *तिया*; hence *dwi-tīya-s*, *tri-tīya-s*. This suffix is easily recognised in the Latin *ter-*

\* However, this and the higher numbers may follow the analogy of *ekādaśa-s*, “the eleventh”; hence, also, *viṃśa*, *triṃśa*, &c. In Zend I am unable to quote the ordinal numbers from twenty upwards.

† In compounds like *fimftataihunda*, “the fifteenth,” the lesser number has either preserved the original theme while still free from the *n*, which was added more lately,—for the lesser number in these compounds does not partake of declension,—or *fimfta* is here the regular abbreviation of the theme *FIMFTAN*, since, as I have already elsewhere remarked (Berl. Ann. May 1827. p. 759), bases in *n*, in strict accordance with the Sanskrit, drop the *n* in the beginning of compounds.

*lius*, as also in the Old Slavonic *trelīř*, fem. *trelīya*, which, like all the ordinal numbers, has only a definite declension, in which, however, the particular case occurs, that the defining element is brought with it direct from the East, while the *tyī* of *chetyertyī* and others, in which, in like manner, a connection with *तीय तीया* might be easily conjectured, is, in fact, connected with the च *tha*, TO, TU of चतुर्थे *chaturtha*, τέταρτος, *quartus*, and has arisen from the indefinite theme in TO (comp. the collective *chetvero*, §. 312.), according to §. 255. (d.), although the simple word in most of the formations falling under this category no longer exists. The same relation, then, that *chetyertyī*, *shestyī*, have to *chaturtha-s*, *shashthas*, *sedmyī*, *osmyī*, have to सप्तम *saplama*, अष्टम *aṣṭama*; and *perryī*, "the first," to पूर्व *pūrva*, "the former;" which expressions, in Slavonic, remain only in combination with the pronominal base *ŮO* (§. 282.). The Zend has rejected the *f* of the suffix *tīya*, and abbreviated *dici* to *bi*; hence *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀 bitya*, *𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 thritya*, in which it is to be remarked that the *y*, which is thus by syncope united with the *t* at a comparatively later period, has gained no aspirating influence (§. 47.). To this Zend *tya* corresponds, by similar suppression of the middle *f*, the Gothic *DYAN* (from *dya*, §. 283.) in *THRIDYAN*, nom. masc. *thridya*, the *y* of which in the Old High German *drillo*, has assimilated itself to the preceding *t*, in analogy with the Prākṛit forms and Greek comparatives, like *θάσσων*, *κρείσσων*, *κρείττων*, mentioned at p. 402. Still closer, however, lies the comparison with *διττός*, *τριττός* (*δισσός*, *τρισσός*), which are evidently, in [G. Id. p. 402.] their origin, one with the corresponding Sanskrit-Zend ordinal numbers; and, in respect of their reduplicated consonant, have the same relation thereto that the Old High German *drillo* has to the Gothic *thriyda*. Regarding *tvaddyē*, "duorum," see p. 422, Note \*: the place of the ordinal number is supplied by the pronoun *anthar* (see p. 377), Old High German *andar*, Middle High German *ander*. Our *zweiter*, however, is a new unorganic formation. The Old Slavonic *vtoryī* (see §. 297.)

answers, in respect to its derivation, to the Greek δύντερος, and, in abbreviation of the base, to the Zend *bitya*, only that it has lost also the *i* of the Sanskrit *dwi-tīya*, in regard to which we have, in §. 297., adverted to the Zend *𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌* *b-yārē\**, “two years.”

323. We give here a general view of the ordinal numbers in the feminine nominative singular, since in this case the agreement of all the languages strikes the eye more than in the nominative masculine. The Gothic forms which do not occur we give in parentheses, formed theoretically, and according to the Old High German.

[G. Ed. p. 463.]

## NOMINATIVE FEMININE.

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GR. DOR.	LATIN.	GOthic.	LITHUANIAN.	OLD SLAVONIC.
<i>prathamā</i> ,	<i>frathēma</i> , <sup>1</sup>	<i>πρώτῃ</i> .	<i>prima</i> ,	<i>fruma</i> ,	<i>pirmā</i> ,	<i>perva-ya</i> .
<i>dwitīyā</i> ,	<i>bitya</i> ,	<i>δευτέρῃ</i> ,	<i>altera</i> ,	<i>anthara</i> ,	<i>antrā</i> ,	<i>vtora-ya</i> .
<i>tritīyā</i> ,	<i>thritya</i> ,	<i>τρίτῃ</i> ,	<i>tertia</i> ,	<i>thridyō</i> ,	<i>trėchid</i> ,	<i>trėti-ya</i> .
<i>chaturthā</i> , <sup>2</sup>	<i>tūīrya</i> ,	<i>τετάρτῃ</i> ,	<i>quarta</i> ,	( <i>fidvōrdō</i> ),	<i>ketvirtā</i> ,	<i>chetverta-ya</i> .
<i>panchamā</i> ,	<i>pugdha</i> ,	<i>πέμπτῃ</i> ,	<i>quinta</i> ,	<i>fimfō</i> ,	<i>penktā</i> ,	<i>pyata-ya</i> . <sup>3</sup>
<i>ṣhaṣṭhā</i> ,	<i>estvā</i> , <sup>4</sup>	<i>ἑκτῃ</i> ,	<i>sexta</i> ,	<i>saihistō</i> ,	<i>szėsztā</i> ,	<i>shesta-ya</i> .
<i>saptamā</i> ,	<i>haptatha</i> ,	<i>ἑβδόμῃ</i> ,	<i>septima</i> ,	( <i>sibundō</i> ),	<i>sėkma</i> ,	<i>sedma-ya</i> .
<i>aṣṭhamā</i> ,	<i>astēma</i> ,	<i>ὀγδόῃ</i> ,	<i>octava</i> ,	<i>ahhtudō</i> ,	<i>āsma</i> ,	<i>osma-ya</i> .
<i>navamā</i> ,	<i>nāuma</i> ,	<i>ἐννὰτῃ</i> ,	<i>nona</i> ,	<i>niundō</i> ,	<i>dewintā</i> , <sup>5</sup>	<i>devyata-ya</i> . <sup>5</sup>
<i>daśamā</i> ,	<i>daśema</i> ,	<i>δεκάτῃ</i> ,	<i>decima</i> ,	<i>taihundō</i> ,	<i>dcszimtā</i> ,	<i>desyata-ya</i> .
<i>ekādaśā</i> ,	<i>aēvandaśa</i> , <sup>6</sup>	<i>ἐνδεκάτῃ</i> ,	<i>undecima</i> ,	( <i>ainlistō</i> ),	<i>wienōlikta</i> ,	<i>yedina-ya-na-desyaty</i>
<i>viṃśati-tamā</i> ,	<i>visaititēma</i> ?	<i>εἰκοστῃ</i> ,	<i>vicesima</i> ,	...	<i>dvidcszimtā</i> ,	<i>vtoraya-na-desyaty</i> .

\* We should read thus §. 297. for *byarē*, as accusative singular (see Olshausen, Vend. S. 43).

<sup>1</sup> More usually *paoīrya*, masc. *paoīryō*, by which the Slavonic *pervyi*, *pervaya*, is, as it were, prepared.

<sup>2</sup> Also *turīyā*, masc. *turīya-s*, on which is based the Zend *tūīrya*, masc. *tūīryō*. The suppression of the syllable *cha* might announce the looser connection of the same with the remaining portion of the word and thereby support the conjecture expressed at §. 311.

<sup>3</sup> The *t* of *pyataya*, masc. *pyatyi*, has nothing in common with the *t* of the cardinal number *pyaty*; the proper primitive is *pya* (see p. 430 Note †), whence *PYATI* by the suffix *TI*, and *PYATO*, fem. *PYATA*, by the suffix *TO*, fem. *TA* (see §. 322.). The same holds good with regard to *shestaya* in relation to *shesty*, &c.

<sup>4</sup> By transposition and syncope from *esvasta*, as must be expected from the cardinal number *𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌* *esvas*.

<sup>5</sup> Regarding the *d* for *n*, see §. 317.

<sup>6</sup> See §. 319, Note \*, p. 435.



"Remark.—As the old *a* of the preposition π *pra* has been weakened to *i*—as in *quinque*, answering to *panchan*—the Latin *prima* appears distinct from the preposition *pro*, and is decidedly not derived from a Roman soil, but is, as it were, the continuance of the Indian *prathamā*, the middle syllable being cast out. A similar weakening of the vowel is exhibited in the Greek adverb πρίν, which is hereby, in like manner, brought into connection with the preposition πρό. In the comparative *prior* only the *pr* of the preposition, which forms the base, is left, as the *i* belongs to the comparative suffix. In Lithuanian the *m* of the superlative formation has introduced itself also into the preposition *pirm*, 'before'; but the unaltered *pra* stands as prefix. To the same base, however, belongs also *pri*, 'by, before,' as well isolated as prefixed. The Gothic *fruma* shews the same relation to *prathamā* that the Latin [G. Ed. p. 461.] and Lithuanian do: the *u* of *fru* has arisen from *a* through the influence of the liquid (§. 66.). In the cognate preposition *fram*, 'before, by,' &c., the original vowel has remained, and in this form, as in the Lithuanian *pirm*, the superlative *m* is contained. On π *pra* is based, also, *faur*, 'before,' with transposition of the *u* of *fru-ma*, and with *a* prefixed, according to §. 82.

## NUMERAL ADVERBS.

324. The adverbs which express the ideas "twice," "thrice," "four times," have been already discussed (p. 435, G. ed.). Let the following serve for a general view of them:—

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	OLD NORTHERN.
<i>dwis</i> ,	<i>bis</i> ,	δις,	<i>bis</i> ,	<i>twis-var</i> (p. 436 G. ed.).
<i>tris</i> ,	<i>thris</i> ,	τρίς,	<i>ter</i> ,	<i>thris-var</i> .
<i>chatur</i> ,*	<i>chathrus</i> ,	....	<i>quater</i> ,	....

\* According to §. 94. for *chatur*.

The Greek forms in *κῖς* like *τετράκῖς*, *πεντάκῖς*, &c., in regard to their suffix, do not belong to this class, but *κῖς* answers to the Sanskrit *śas* (§. 21.), the *a* being weakened to *i*; this *śas*, however, forms adverbs from words which express a great number, multitude or number, as *śataśas*, "by hundreds," *sahasraśas*, "by thousands," *bahuśas*, "of many kinds," *gaṇaśas*, "in swarms." The original idea of the suffix in both languages is that of repetition, but *e.g.* *śataśas* is an indefinite repetition of a hundred, while in *ἐκατοντάκῖς* the repetition is strictly defined by the numeral. How stands it, then, with the Latin forms like *quingies*, *sexies*, &c.? I believe that in respect to their suffix they are connected neither with the forms in *s* like *duis*, *δῖς*, nor with

[G. Ed. p. 465.] those in *κῖς* (*śas*), by suppression of the guttural; but as *toties*, *quoties*, evidently belong to this class, which are also pronounced *quotiens*, *totiens*, this probably being the more genuine form, as in Greek, in a similar case, *τιθένς* is more genuine than *τιθείς* (§. 138.), I therefore prefer bringing these forms in *ens*, *es*, into conjunction with the Sanskrit suffix *vant* (in the weak cases *vat*), which signifies, in pronominal bases, "much," but elsewhere, "gifted with," and the nominative of which is, in Zend, *vanis*, *e.g.* *chvanis*, "how much," for *chivanis*. This suffix has, in Sanskrit, in combination with the interrogative base *ki*, and the demonstrative base *i*, laid aside the *v*; hence *kiy-ant*, *iy-ant*—weak form *kiyat*, *iyat*—nominative masculine *kiyān*, *iyān*; this *ant* for *vant* answers therefore to the Greek ENT (nominative masculine *εις*), *e.g.* in *μελιτόεις*, and also to the Latin *ens*, in *totiens*, *quotiens*, which indeed are, in form, masculine nominatives, but must also be considered as neuters, as in the participles, too, in *nt*, the masculine nominative has forced its way into the neuter. Now comes the question whether we ought to divide *toti-ens* *quoti-ens*, or *tot-i-ens*, *quot-i-ens*? In the former case *tot*, *quot*, would have preserved, in this combination, the *i*

which belongs to them, for they are based on the Sanskrit *तति lati*, "so much," *कति kati*, "how much";\* and the *ens* in *toti-ens* would, according to that, express the "time," and *toti*, "so much." In the division *tot-i-ens*, however, we should have to assume that in *i-ens*, the abovementioned demonstrative *इयन् iyant*, "so much," is contained, but in such wise, that only the meaning of the suffix is still perceived. Under this supposition *quingu-ies* [G. Ed. p. 466.] would, accordingly, express "five-somuch" (times); in the former case, however, the *i*, ns *quingui-es*, *octi-es*, would have to pass as representative of the *e* and *o* of *quinque*, *octo*, and that of *series* ns n conjunctive vowel, or as an accommodation to the prevailing analogy. In any case, however, the identity of the suffix *ens*, *es*, with the Sanskrit *ant*, from *vant*, is highly probable. The Sanskrit expresses the idea "times" from five upwards by *kṛitras*; as, पञ्चकृतम् *panchakṛitras*, "five times." This *kṛitras* comes from *kṛit*, "making," which in *sakṛit*, "once," is sufficient of itself; the annexed *ras*, however, might, by exchange of the *t* for *s* (compare §. 156. Note \*), have arisen from *rat*, which should be given above as the weak theme for *vant*; as, *tārat*, "so much," *yārat*, "how much" (rel.). With *kṛit* from *kart* (§. 1.) is clearly connected the Lithuanian *karta-s*, "time," a masculine substantive, which, like the defining number, is put in the accusative, in order to make up for the adverbs under discussion; e.g. *viena kartą*, "once," *dvi kartus*, "twice" (accusative *du*), *tris kartus*, "three times." In Old Slavonic the corresponding *krat* or *kraty* is not declined, and the former appears to be an abbrevia-

---

\* These are neuters, which, in common with the numerals पञ्च *panchan*, "five," &c. (§. 313.), have, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative, a singular form; in the other cases, plural terminations; while in Latin *quot*, *tot*, like *quinque*, &c., become completely indeclinable.

tion of the latter, for it cannot be brought into direct comparison with the Sanskrit कृत् *krīṭ* on account of §. 255. (l.): *kraty*, however, is to be deduced from कृत्वस् *krīṭwas*, by suppression of the *v*. With regard to the *y* for *as* compare §. 271.

325. Through the suffix धा *dha* the Sanskrit forms adverbs in sense and in form, corresponding to the Greek in χα, which, therefore, have altered the *T* sound of the suffix into a corresponding guttural, by the usual exchange of organ in aspirates, as in OPNIX for OPNIΘ, and in the forms mentioned at p. 401 G. ed. Compare,

[G. Ed. p. 407.]

द्विधा <i>dvi-dhā</i> ,	δι-χα.
त्रिधा <i>tri-dhā</i> ,	τρι-χα.
चतुर्धा <i>chatur-dhā</i> ,	τέτρα-χα.
पञ्चधा <i>pancha-dhā</i> ,	πέντα-χα.

---

\* "Divided into two parts," Sav. V. 103.

